

The Biblical Review

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
BIBLE TEACHERS TRAINING SCHOOL

WILBERT W. WHITE, *Editor*

ROBERT M. KURTZ, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors:

JOHN L. DEARING, for Japan

JAMES S. GALE, for Korea

JOSHUA C. GARRITT, for China

SAMUEL M. ZWEMER, for the Near East

JULIUS RICHTER, for Germany

*The general diffusion of the Bible is the most effectual way
to civilize and humanize mankind.*—CHANCELLOR KENT.

Vol. I.

APRIL, 1916

No. 2

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL:	PAGE
THE TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	165
MODERN DISLIKE OF THE MESSIANIC CONSCIOUSNESS IN JESUS. GEERHARDUS VOS.....	170
THE VERIFICATION OF CHRISTIANITY. LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET	186
CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY. HERMAN BAVINCK.....	214
THE DAY OF PENTECOST. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.....	237
THE REVISED VERSION AND THE GREEK TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. MATTHEW B. RIDDLE.....	249
PAULINISM. FREDERICK LINCOLN ANDERSON.....	262
LUKE 2:14. WILLIAM F. OLDHAM.....	278
THE COUNTRY CHURCH. PAUL DWIGHT MOODY.....	286
COLLATERAL READINGS ON THE INTERNATIONAL SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS.....	301
LITERARY REVIEWS.....	307

THE SUBSCRIPTION PRICE OF THE BIBLICAL REVIEW IS ONE DOLLAR a year, prepaid in American territory, in Canada, Mexico, and Samoa. For all other countries, add thirty cents postage. Single copies, thirty cents. Receipt of subscription is indicated on the wrapper. REMITTANCES should be sent by draft on New York, Express Order, or Money Order, payable to THE BIBLICAL REVIEW. CHANGE OF ADDRESS—For change, give both old and new addresses.

Address: THE BIBLICAL REVIEW
541 LEXINGTON AVENUE - - - NEW YORK, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter, December 17, 1912, at the Post Office at New York, New York, under the Act of August 24, 1912.
Copyright, 1916, by Bible Teachers Training School

THE BIBLE TEACHERS TRAINING SCHOOL

A BRIEF STATEMENT OF ITS DESIGN, SCOPE, ORGANIZATION, EQUIPMENT, CURRICULUM, HISTORY, AND PRINCIPLES

It is a Divinity School, evangelical, interdenominational, and intervocational, designed for the training of ministers and other Christian leaders and workers.

Chartered by the Regents of the University of the State of New York.

Governed by a Board of twenty-five Trustees, representing (at present) the American Episcopal, the Methodist Episcopal, the Baptist, the Reformed, the United Evangelical, and the Presbyterian Churches. The Board must be interdenominational.

Conducting the following group of Schools:

A School of Theology (with a three years course).

A School of Pedagogy (with a three years course).

A School of Missions (with a two years course).

A School for Bible Teachers (with a two years course).

A School for Graduates and for Special Students.

In all of these the Organizing Discipline is the study of the Bible in the student's mother-tongue.

Directing a special department for the training of workers among Italians, which has sent out into this important field thirty-five ordained ministers of eight denominations and forty-two trained lay workers. These ministers have organized twenty-seven Italian churches and missions.

Developing an Extension Department, which has enrolled in the year 1915-16 over 1,800 students, including those in five special classes.

Having a supervised Practical Work Department in which, during the year 1915-16, over 260 appointments are filled weekly by students.

Publishing THE BIBLICAL REVIEW, quarterly, which has a circulation among ministers and leading workers throughout the world.

Situated in the heart of the great Western Metropolis with all the cosmopolitan advantages incidental to its location.

Affording also the great cultural advantages of a cosmopolitan company of students, representing (1914-15) twenty-eight denominations, twenty-five countries, thirty states of the Union, and over one hundred and twenty colleges, universities, and seminaries. The enrolment for the year 1914-15, excluding the Extension

Department, was three hundred and seventy-five. Among these were forty-one foreign missionaries and thirty-eight foreign missionary candidates. (Statistics for 1915-16 are not yet complete.)

Possessing a carefully selected working Library of over nine thousand volumes, in charge of a professional librarian and staff.

With a Faculty of fourteen members who give full time to the work, together with a representative corps of special lecturers.

Offering unsurpassed opportunity for first-hand, thorough, and unbiased study of the Bible in the student's mother-tongue as the most important part of training for any kind of Christian activity.

Emphasizing as essential elements in equipment: (1) Character Building, (2) Ability to Teach, (3) Training in Practical Work, and (4) Broad Culture.

Laying special emphasis on fundamental training, while at the same time allowing large elective choice in departments subordinate and vocational.

Showing a record of fifteen years of steady progress, including Summer terms in the Far East in 1910, 1911, and 1912, where the School has been officially endorsed and signally honored as a model by the Nanking School of Theology, the Foochow Union Theological School, and the Pierson Memorial Bible School, of Seoul, Korea.

Enjoying the confidence of the Christian public, largely because of its clear and unmistakably non-sectarian, yet inter-denominational and evangelical, basis, its studied avoidance of conscious bias and unnecessary antagonisms, its policy of standing for fundamentals in Biblical knowledge and Christian practice, and its employment of the most approved educational methods.

Also officially approved by two denominations in the home land as the training center for their ministry.

Committed to the policy of eliminating duplication and waste of every kind, the avoidance of exploiting negation, and the giving of constant prominence to the great abiding spiritual forces, such as the reality and efficacy of prayer, the saving work of the risen and living Christ, and the illuminating influence and energizing power of the Spirit and Word of God.

Standing for the conviction that the greatest need of the Church Universal is knowledge of the Scriptures, and that the desired unity of Christendom is to come not merely on the lines of sentiment and practical work, but in a deeper agreement as to the verities of faith which will follow the real *study of the Bible together*.

Catalogue and other literature sent on application to

WILBERT W. WHITE, *President*

BIBLE TEACHERS TRAINING SCHOOL
541 LEXINGTON AVENUE - - - NEW YORK, N. Y.

Christianity in its essence is not a definite quantity of moral truths or teachings, but a series of facts. It is Christ Himself, His person and work, the religion of the incarnation of God in Christ, and the redemption of the world there resulting. In other words, Christianity is essentially miraculous.

THEODORE CHRISTLIEB.

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

Vol. I.

APRIL, 1916

No. 2

EDITORIAL

THE TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOR the greater part the material in this issue of **THE BIBLICAL REVIEW** applies to the New Testament or to its central Personality. Christology, apologetics, history, Paul's theology, questions of the text, are among the topics which characterize the papers appearing herein.

Did Jesus regard Himself as the Messiah? In the article upon the present dislike of the Messianic consciousness in Jesus, we have something more than an academic question, of interest only to the trained mind of the theologian. The doubtful attitude of many within the church itself respecting the divinity of our Lord demands a setting forth of His own conscious placing of Himself both as to His own nature and in the light of prophecy. It will add greatly to one's interest in the subject to remember that in this paper by Dr. Vos we have the conclusions of a scholar who has devoted much time and attention to the matter under consideration. While the author handles the question by considering especially the disbelief in, or more aptly the dislike of, Christ's consciousness of His

Messiahship, he also develops a strong argument in support of this consciousness on the part of Christ. The clear, methodical, and forceful style, devoid of any excursus into tempting rhetorical fields which perpetually lie about every sublime theme, with the absence of acerbity, give an atmosphere of sincerity and conviction to the whole deliverance consistent with the profound importance of the question involved.

The apprentice is eager to shape the materials before he has thoroughly learned the use of the tools, and the hasty student tries to solve his problem before he has comprehended the principles of mathematics that apply to it. In the study of any subject which of necessity involves the principles of knowledge and of psychology, unless such preliminary questions are cared for in their proper order, the difficulties incident to their lack must inevitably crop out. When one discusses Christian truth with the hopeful and confident young thinker he is almost certain to elicit questions as to how we know and what we may believe. Dr. Sweet's article, *The Verification of Christianity*, brings out this point very clearly. The purpose of his discussion, as to its bearing on Christianity, may best be set forth in his own words: "We are not now attempting a proof, merely indicating the sphere within which the proof must be conducted." He has, however, rendered a distinct service to all who, even upon impromptu occasions, are called to deal with questions of apologetics, for he has pointed out the ground whereon apologetics may most firmly stand.

What is the outstanding difference between Christianity and other religions? Among people generally there is a surprising lack of ability to answer this question. To most minds the merely ethical element

dominates all others—Christianity has the highest ethical standards, and therefore it is the truest religion. Dr. Bavinck not only gives Christ His supreme position, but he also very ably indicates the agreement concerning Him among the New Testament writers, and shows that their records enable us to comprehend the “original Christianity.” Furthermore this paper, upon Christ and Christianity, from a scholar of such reputation, must help the reader to appreciate how solid is the basis on which rests the belief in the traditional early dates of New Testament material.

If Pentecost marks the day or the event from which the history of the church is usually dated, its historical and religious aspects merit particular attention. Dr. Thomas has given us a brief paper in which he places this transitional occasion with its varied significance very plainly before us. Events that stand between different historical periods or orders are prone to be confusing; elements of the old and the new mingle to the perplexity of the student. It is fortunate when a writer of Dr. Thomas’ sympathetic habits of mind and clarifying style of expression turns his attention to a subject of this kind.

With the ministry to-day so largely drawn from the ranks of the highly educated, presumably a higher proportion than ever are interested in the Greek Testament. It is therefore a good thing to be refreshed occasionally upon questions of the Greek text itself. Moreover, all intelligent Bible students will welcome any light thrown upon problems of revision. Dr. Riddle, who writes in this issue upon the Revised Version and the Greek Text of the New Testament, is the sole surviving member of the American Revision Committee, appointed in 1871, and consisting of thirty-

two "leading Bible scholars in the colleges and seminaries of the Protestant denominations in the United States." Seventeen of that committee formed the New Testament company, and to this Dr. Riddle belonged. His paper clearly indicates that the revisers carefully sought to avoid a bias toward any particular text, but rather considered in a judicial manner the claims of each of the variant "readings."

One of the marks of a truly great subject is that it not only persists in holding its share of men's general interest, but that it continues to yield results to succeeding generations of students. Paul and his utterances form an old but never a threadbare topic. In Dr. Anderson's paper upon Paulinism we have in perspective the great points in the Apostle's conversion, in his attitude toward the Law, and in his teaching generally. These things are set forth in a direct and very clear style. One fault of many writers upon profound matters is a tendency toward heavily involved sentences. The reader who wants a brief account of Paul's views will appreciate the ease with which he can "take in" these statements. Such a paper as this, in addition to its own contribution to its subject, forms a good starting point for one's renewed study of the matters covered.

Some time ago we asked Bishop Oldham to give his impressions of the religious situation after more than a year of war. He has written from the altitude of the celebration of Christ's birth—the advent of the Prince of Peace. There is an extravagant type of optimism that defeats its own influence by its evident purpose to keep up courage. Here, however, we have a sober and reflective hopefulness which really warms and strengthens. Throughout the world a tendency

to weariness, apprehension, and depression increases with the struggle. It is a relief to hear some other note and to be reminded that the foundation of our Christian hope standeth sure.

The country church persists in claiming special attention. In fact, it has come almost to the point of a very distinct institution in the minds of some writers. Now, it is a very favorable tendency which makes for the study of an institution with particular respect to its environment. To consider that a church is simply a church, capable of equal effectiveness wherever it be planted, without regard to the necessity of adaptability, is to ignore a grasp of human nature which any tradesman is supposed to have. Nevertheless, even differentiation may be carried too far, as Mr. Moody reminds us in his contribution to the literature of the country church. He does not lose sight of the fact that human nature is a constant in all such problems. He stands in the position of a man who is far enough from a subject to appreciate its proportions, yet close enough for sympathetic knowledge of its difficulties.

MODERN DISLIKE OF THE MESSIANIC CONSCIOUSNESS IN JESUS

By GEERHARDUS VOS, Professor of Biblical Theology in Princeton
Theological Seminary

ONE of the most significant developments in modern discussion of the life and teaching of Jesus is the growing disfavor into which the Messianic element in the Gospels has fallen with a certain class of writers. We do not refer to skepticism or denial in regard to the Messiahship objectively considered. The question whether or not Jesus was the Messiah has meaning only within the limits of a strict Biblical supernaturalism. It presupposes the recognition of the reality of both prophecy and the fulfilment of prophecy, and therefore finds its natural place in the controversy between Jesus and His opponents in the Gospel narrative, as it also has been the dividing issue ever since between the Christian church and Judaism. With the modern Jew, on the other hand, who has lost his belief in the supernatural, it were foolish to argue about the fact of Jesus' Messiahship, for on his premises the unreality of this fact is *a priori* included in the impossibility of all supernatural phenomena.

The question about the Messianic consciousness belongs to a totally different situation. It deals exclusively with the problem, whether Jesus believed and claimed to be the Messiah, and deals with it altogether irrespectively of the warrant in fact for such a belief or claim. Those who incline to answer it in the negative do not, as a rule, occupy the standpoint of supernaturalism. They are like the modern Jew in

this respect, that for them the Messianic reality is an impossible thing and in so far void of practical interest. From a religious point of view Jesus is not valuable for them in the capacity of the Messiah but under some other aspect, variously defined, be it as a religious genius or an ethical teacher or a social reformer. One might expect from this religious detachment that such writers would be peculiarly fitted to discuss the question of the Messianic consciousness on a purely historical and psychological basis, after the most calm and disinterested fashion, since, whichever way the balance of evidence may incline, the result cannot affect or disturb them in their inner religious conviction. The expectation is not fulfilled. To a careful observer of the trend of discussion it soon becomes apparent that something warmer and more exciting than an average academic interest is animating those who take part in it. Although the arguments that are plied to and fro are of a strictly exegetical and historical character, it is undeniable that the "heart which makes the theologian" is not so utterly absent from the debate as some would fain have us believe.

How is this theological atmosphere which persists in clinging to the discussion to be explained? The explanation is not far to seek. Absolute disinterestedness, even in regard to the consciousness of Jesus, is possible only where one has lost all religious touch with Jesus and denies to Him all significance in the sphere of one's own spiritual life. So long as any personal religious attachment to Jesus, of however attenuated a kind, is retained, the question what Jesus thought of Himself, and consequently the problem of the Messianic consciousness, immediately asserts its importance and ceases to be a matter of unconcern.

Now to a large extent the writers who hesitate or refuse to ascribe to Jesus the Messianic consciousness are not prepared to eliminate His figure entirely from the field of their practical religion. They have not ceased to be Christians in so far as they still invest Jesus with a supreme spiritual significance for themselves and desire to sustain a specifically religious relation toward Him. They have some category of religious pre-eminence or leadership under which they classify what Jesus is for them. Every category, however, of this kind carries with it certain definite implications as to the inner life of Jesus; it assumes within Him a kind of self-consciousness such as is in accordance with the spiritual interrelation which those, who regard Him in this light, seek to cultivate. And while this is so positively, it also works in a negative direction. Every religious classification of Jesus has its exclusions as well as its inclusions. While it must needs postulate a certain state of consciousness, it must with equal necessity extrude and repel certain other forms of self-estimate on the part of Jesus, on the ground of their being incompatible with, or uncongenial to, the religious regard entertained for, or the spiritual fellowship exercised with, Him.

Looked at from this standpoint the Messianic consciousness may prove as objectionable an element and equally difficult to deal with as the Messianic fact. Nay, it is easy to see how the former may prove more obnoxious and more troublesome than the latter, because it lies in the sphere of what is historically and psychologically verifiable concerning the life of Jesus, whereas belief or disbelief in the Messiahship partakes far more of the character of a dogmatic judgment about the significance of Jesus, such as is not

capable of direct scientific substantiation. The Messiahship one can let alone on theological or philosophical grounds; the Messianic consciousness is aggressive and will not let anyone alone who at all makes the figure of Jesus an object of serious study and finds in it a source of religious inspiration. If the Messianic consciousness is real, then there is danger that at any moment it may turn back upon any favorite character or consciousness that the modern mind has projected into Jesus and expose the latter as unreal, because it could not possibly have dwelt together with the consciousness of Messiahship.

It is of course true that many at the present day declare their fellowship with Jesus independent of the acceptance or rejection of what Jesus Himself in His humanly and historically limited state of mind may have regarded as true, and apparently succeed in doing so. Their identification with Jesus is not one in the sphere of belief, at least not along the whole range of belief. Difference in theoretical religious outlook, even at important points, does not to their view preclude the sympathy and oneness in religious feeling and aspiration in which they continue to recognize the enduring center of their allegiance to Him. Still, it may be doubted whether this can be carried on to the extent of an emancipation from that focus of belief which constituted in Jesus His self-consciousness. If we may judge from the analogy of interhuman fellowship in such forms as love and friendship it must be next to impossible so to feel in the religious sphere where all spiritual powers acquire a heightened sensitiveness and evince a desire for absolute possession and interpenetration. Communion between friends can survive where differences of

opinion arise concerning outside matters. But where the difference of opinion relates to the inner life and touches the point of view from which one of the friends regards himself, there the very basis of spiritual fellowship becomes endangered, because the central point upon which it is exercised loses its transparency and accessibleness; there is created a neutral indifferent area, where the love or friendship finds its limit and is made to feel its own deficiency. Even so, only to a far stronger degree, it must be with every religious attitude toward Jesus which attempts to stop short of accepting and treating Him at the face value of His official self-estimate. In the same proportion that one hesitates so to receive Him a principle of reserve and estrangement enters into the relationship; the circles of the subject and the object of religious communion intersect but no longer perfectly coincide. No one can take a Saviour to his heart in that absolute, unqualified sense, which constitutes the glory of religious trust, if there lies in the background of his mind the thought that this Saviour failed to understand Himself. If once it is established that He meant to be that very definite kind of spiritual helper, which by historical right we designate as "the Messiah," then it becomes difficult to refuse His help in that very capacity, and force upon Him a rôle of religious helpfulness which He was not Himself conscious of sustaining. The inherent perverseness of such a situation in a field where everything ought to be straightforward lies on the surface.

We believe that the doubt cast upon the Messianic consciousness springs from an inner dislike of it, and that the dislike springs from the instinctive perception of its unsuitableness and unmanageableness as a com-

panion to those other forms of consciousness, which the liberal theology is wont to regard as central in the mind and purpose of Jesus, but which are in reality nothing but a reflex of its own beliefs and ideals. We do not mean that there is anything intentional about this process, that the critical treatment of this element in the Gospel account is subject to any conscious desire for manipulating the facts in the interest of a foregone conclusion. Instances of such a procedure are fortunately rare in the history of criticism. So far as conscious intent is concerned most writers mean to practice a fair objectivity. It would be foolish, however, on that account to close one's eyes to the important influence which, in the face of an honest purpose to the contrary, theological sympathies and prepossessions exercise in the weight that is given to facts and the judgment that is passed upon them. There is an inevitable, unconscious partiality from which, where actual and practical issues are at stake, no historical investigator with the best will in the world can entirely free himself. While no moral blame can attach to this, it is none the less necessary to take this factor into account in criticising any process of argumentation, be it one's own or that of an opponent. Instances may occur where its influence is so preponderant as to create a real weakness in the objective argument that is made out in support of a position.

It seems to us that the debate about the Messianic consciousness is a case of this kind. Two considerations incline us to this opinion. In the first place, the objective arguments of a historico-critical nature advanced against the reality of this consciousness are of themselves so inadequate to support the conclusion based upon them as to suggest that theological

proclivity must have made their weight appear greater to those who handle them than it is in reality. So much more and so much of a more cogent character can be urged in favor of the view that Jesus believed Himself the Messiah than can be urged against it that one involuntarily looks for something subjective back of the arguments for the latter view to account for the confidence placed in their sufficiency. And, in the second place, the actual content of the Messianic consciousness is such as to be exceptionally adapted to provoke reaction and dissent in the "modern" or "liberal" religious mind. It would be difficult to find a case where two ways of thinking appear to be so pointedly at variance and have so little in common as the Messianic way of thinking on the one hand and the thought form of "liberal" Christianity on the other hand. Of the first of these two grounds for our conviction we expect to render an account on some future occasion. For the present we confine ourselves to a brief explanation of the second.

It has taken interpreters of the life and teaching of Jesus considerable time to realize the full import of the Messianic idea which the Gospels represent Jesus as applying to Himself. At first the idea was supposed to belong to a much lower plane than was afterward seen to be the case. Consequently in that earlier period the claim to Messiahship could still be regarded as compatible with a limited, purely human self-consciousness. To be sure, even at that time some recognized that in the conception of Jesus' Messiahship lay the fruitful source of all the high attributes with which subsequently His figure became invested in the faith of the church. But this was not at that time thought to be a logical explication of the actual

Messianic consciousness as it lived in the mind of Jesus; it was looked upon as an illogical process in the mind of the church. Jesus Himself had kept His Messiahship within the terms of creaturehood and human subordination to God. The church had without historical warrant so enlarged the conception of Messiahship as to make it practically inclusive of Deity. Such was the original position in consequence of which at first no umbrage was taken at the Messianic consciousness. Later on, however, when the structure and development of the Messianic idea came to be studied more closely, and the tremendous proportions which it had attained in the mind of Jesus to be more adequately realized, this view had to be modified. It is now seen that all the elements of the high Christology to which so much aversion is felt are implicitly given in the Messianic consciousness as its integral constituents or necessary correlates. Not first the church, not first the tradition; no, the historical life, the historical mind of Jesus enfolded in the Messiahship all that belongs to His unique super-human nature and dignity. He already must have thought the one in the other. Thus the acute situation is created in which the consciousness of the modernized Jesus finds itself face to face with the totally heterogeneous consciousness of the Messianic Jesus of the Gospels, and feels that it cannot befriend itself with the latter without denying its own right of existence. Unwilling to do this, its only escape lies through denying the historicity of the Messianic consciousness. Hence the eagerness and energy with which it has thrown itself upon all the phenomena that seemed to discredit the tradition that Jesus considered Himself the Messiah.

The three factors which chiefly impart this un-modern and anti-modern complexion to the Messianic consciousness are the supernatural character of the office, its soteric purpose, and the co-equality with God which it postulates for its bearer.

The Messiahship is the most pronouncedly supernaturalistic conception in the whole range of Biblical teaching. To think in Messianic terms is to think in the terms of supernaturalism. The Messianic is really a species of the eschatological. When we say that the Biblical religion is an eschatological religion we mean that it ascribes to the world process a definite goal, such as cannot be attained by it in the natural course of affairs, but will be brought on catastrophically by a direct, divine interposition making an end of the present world order and introducing a new order of transcendental character. Eschatology, therefore, marks the goal of all that exists and happens as supernatural, and in doing this it further assumes that the final consummation is preceded by a history, full of equally supernatural transactions in keeping with the end set for it all. It is in this setting that we must place the Messianic idea. The Messiah gathers and sums up in Himself this whole movement toward the supernatural, bringing by His appearance and work the entire process to its ultimate fruition. The figure of the Messiah is steeped in eschatology. That we do not more clearly realize this is due to the fact that for us the Messiah has come and accomplished a great part of His task, and yet what we call the eschatological crisis is still outstanding. But to the Old Testament point of view, and to the point of view of Jesus' time, and to the point of view of Jesus Himself, the coming of the Messiah signified the fulfilment of

the eschatological expectation in its most comprehensive sense. Owing to the apocalyptic development through which the Messianic idea had passed, this identification of it with eschatological values had become even more thorough than before. And to Jesus still more than to the mind of any apocalyptic seer the Messiahship stood for a series of supernatural processes and transactions. It stood for acute, not evolutionary, changes, for miracles and miraculous regeneration of all things. To de-Messianize the consciousness of Jesus, therefore, means to desupernaturalize it, and vice versa.

Jesus was not a person the center of whose thought lay in the natural relation of man to God, with a little fringe remaining upon Him from the outgrown garment of apocalyptic, but one who lived and moved and had His being in the world of the supernatural, to whom the thought of the world to come was the life-breath of His religion. Such a mind will not fit into the humanitarian idealism of which the "liberal" theology would make Jesus the exponent. What unconsciously underlies the aversion to the idea of Messiahship is at bottom nothing else but the desire to do away with the large bulk of supernaturalism which the former trails in its wake. It is interesting to observe how this anti-supernaturalistic motive has asserted itself and put in its work along closely parallel lines in both Old Testament and New Testament criticism. There are Old Testament critics who believe that the Messianic hope cannot have formed part of the teaching of the great ethical prophets of Israel, and this on the ground that the Messianic hope is inherently bound up with magical, miraculous, we would say supernatural, processes, whereas the interest of these

prophets centered in moral movements dependent on an appeal to and a response from the free will of man. It is in both cases the naturalism of the modern way of thinking that seeks to expel the supernaturalism of the old view; and in both cases the center of the latter is reconnoitered and attacked in the idea of Messiahship.

The second chief motive that tends to render the Messianic consciousness objectionable lies in the soteric purpose of the Messiahship. The Messiah stands for "salvation," indeed "Saviour" is the most popular name by which the Christ has come to be named among His followers. The saving aspect of the work of Jesus, its "evangelical" character, cannot for a moment be separated from His Messiahship. It is illustrated chiefly in His healing miracles, and these miracles He performed in a Messianic capacity; they are not mere humanitarian acts, but mark the points where the regenerating, life-giving, world-renewing power of the Kingdom has entered into this life and established itself as the beginning of the life to come. According to the uniform usage of the New Testament, Gospels as well as epistles, "to save" means, when applied in a spiritual sense, to rescue from the eternal death of the judgment and to introduce into the eternal life of the world to come. All weakening, attenuating interpretations that have been put upon the idea are excluded at the outset by this Messianic setting in which it appears to the mind of Jesus, and to the mind of the New Testament generally. Formally it is, of course, possible to represent Jesus in some lowered sense, as a saving teacher or a saving prophet, a saving social reformer. But this can be done only at the expense of historic truth, because, so construed, the

idea of salvation is wrenched from its Messianic, eschatological mooring and becomes something else than Jesus meant by it.

Now this old, solid idea of salvation, the basis of all "evangelical" religion, has become a stumbling block to the modern mind in many quarters. While the terms "Saviour" and "salvation" are not discarded, the substance of the transaction is entirely sacrificed. The question, therefore, arises how the Jesus of the Gospels can be freed of this antiquated, magical idea of salvation and become a fit exponent of the new Pelagian evangel of "uplift." There is but one way of doing this, and that is by stripping the Jesus of the Gospels of His Messianic character. The moment this falls off Him, the distasteful soteriological notions of atonement, regeneration, justification disappear with it one and all. They are enucleated in their Messianic root. And here also the Old Testament parallel is interesting. Among the motives that have led to the denial of the genuineness of some of the greatest Messianic prophecies has been the feeling that the ideas of free grace and supernatural transformation, so prominent in them, are out of keeping with the intensely ethical spirit of the prophets. It is again the Pelagian view of religion which seeks to dislodge the Augustinian view from its double stronghold in prophecy and Gospel.

Anti-supernaturalism and anti-evangelicalism are not, however, the sole forces which have fostered the modern dislike of the Messianism in the life and mind of Jesus. There is a third motive, which we believe to be even more potent than these. The Messianic consciousness is interlinked with the right of the Deity of our Lord to a place in the Christian world view and

the Christian religion. If Jesus felt Himself the Messiah in the full sense of the word, then He must have assigned Himself a place in the scale of being above the creature and alongside God. The whole high Christology of the church lies in this as in a nutshell. Nor is this a mere theological matter. If He claims to be the Messiah, this determines not merely our theological judgment in regard to His person; it practically determines the devotional attitude of our hearts in respect to Him. In a Messianic capacity He must have meant to draw toward Himself the prayer, the faith, the worship of His followers; whereas, if He classified Himself un-Messianically, He must have intended as a prophet or teacher or reformer to keep Himself outside the range of these devotional operations of our souls; our prayer, our faith, our worship will, if we heed His own desire, have to pass Him by, and, without being intercepted by Him, will have to terminate directly upon God. To refuse to put into the mind of Jesus the Messianic consciousness means to refuse to put the consciousness of Deity there and His claim to be the rightful recipient of religion. Although this may not be true of every aspect of the Messiahship, since the idea does not always in the Old Testament appear in its highest potency, yet it is eminently true of the Messiahship as conceived by our Lord Himself. Here the indispensableness of strictly divine prerogatives in order to the adequate exercise of its functions springs into view immediately. This is due to the thorough spiritualizing of the idea which it has undergone in the mind of Jesus. So long as the Messiah's task is conceived to lie in the sphere of external, national, earthly kingship and salvation, it remains possible to regard Him

as the representative of God without investing Him with divine attributes. But when His function comes to lie in the sphere of spiritual relationship to God, when He is conceived as the intermediary in the specifically religious concerns of the soul with God, then His calling places Him in the very center of the field where the forces of religion play; then it becomes immediately imperative that He shall Himself belong to the category of the divine. How can He for God receive trust and answer prayer and accept worship and forgive sin and cleanse the soul and quicken the dead and judge the world, unless there be in Him the prime qualification for these functions, that He be God, for these functions are functions which God cannot delegate to any creature, not even to the Messiah as supreme in the scale of creation?

It is plain, therefore, that the consciousness of Deity in our Lord is postulated by the thoroughly spiritualized character of His Messianic consciousness. This is fully in accord with our Lord's own statements concerning the manner in which His Messiahship objectively rests on and grows out of His divine Sonship. The subjective connection of thought is here but a reflex of the objective relationship in reality. Looking at it from this point of view we may say that the Son of God was the only one in whom the Messianic idea could come into its full rights and into its ripe fruition in the religious sphere, the only one who could make out of it an eternal thing, the only one who could receive it with its absolute content into His own life and consciousness without committing blasphemy and trespassing upon the rights of God.

It will perhaps be said that the propositions just laid down—no Messiahship without Deity, no con-

sciousness of Messiahship without consciousness of Deity—cannot be reversed. In the abstract this is true. It is logically quite possible to affirm the Deity of our Lord and the consciousness thereof, and yet to deny His Messianic character and His consciousness in regard to it. But practically this is of no significance. The cases will be rare where persons are believers in the true Deity of our Lord and yet draw back from affirming His Messianic office and state of mind. Such cases are oddities in the world of doctrinal thinking; their place is in museums, not in the outdoors of living religious thought. Where faith has taken the infinitely greater leap of affirming the Deity of Jesus, it can only by a queer perversity of nature hesitate to take the smaller one of affirming His Messianic character. Where such a position is apparently assumed, it will be found on closer examination that not the full Deity of our Lord in the accepted sense is avowed, but a modified, metaphorical sort of Deity which puts less strain on faith for accepting it than the Messiahship would. Besides, the view stated, while logically possible, is entirely out of touch with the situation as it has historically developed itself. In reality the disclosure of the Deity of Jesus has been made in the closest touch with and in constant dependence on the disclosure of His Messianic dignity and work. The knowledge of His Messiahship has not been added to that of His Deity, so that it subsequently could be separated from the Deity and leave the latter intact. The reverse is true; the historical revelation process has been the opposite to that of the order of existence.

As a matter of fact those who reject the Messianic consciousness do not do so because they have something higher and more inclusive which would render it super-

fluous as a distinct item of faith. They do so because they desire to substitute something lower and less difficult to believe. We are not asked to cease calling Him the Christ, because after calling Him Lord and God we could not possibly do more. What we are asked to do is this, to drop the name Christ, because He shall suffice us as an example, a teacher, a leader. And because it is awkward to receive Him at this lower value, with the historical fact staring one in the face, that He thought it necessary to offer Himself at an infinitely higher value, therefore it is impossible that the Messianic consciousness should be allowed its place in our Lord's life without criticism or molestation. The whole innate trend of modern religious thinking is against recognizing it. There is only one alternative to this. For those who despair of eliminating it on historical grounds, it becomes what it was to the Jews of our Lord's lifetime, the great *skandalon*, the offense, which leads to the rejection not of His Messiahship only, but to the rejection of Jesus Himself.

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY.

THE VERIFICATION OF CHRISTIANITY

By LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET, S. T. D., Professor of Christian Theology
and Apologetics, Bible Teachers Training School

IT IS a well-known principle of military science, we are told, that battles are often lost or won before they are fought. Victories are organized or defeats made inevitable, before armies take the field, in the war councils of cabinets and generals. Moreover, we have heard it said that military advantage consists largely in the ability to force the fighting and to determine when, where, and under what conditions battles shall be fought. In our apologetic discussions, wherein we have endeavored to maintain Christianity against opposition and attack, we have too often allowed the opposition, figuratively speaking, to force the fighting and to determine under what conditions the discussion as to the truthfulness of Christianity shall be conducted. They have prescribed the presuppositions which shall govern the debate, and have dictated the nature, extent, and form of proof demanded.

It is more or less of an open secret among religious educators, though not realized by the Christian public as it should be, that the battle for Christian faith is sometimes lost before it is won. No one who has had any intimate contact with students in the way of religious education can possibly be unaware that the eclipse of faith is the outcome of a process set in motion long before any specific religious problems come into view. The astronomer is able, on the basis of the known laws of motion, to predict that on a given date the moon will pass between the earth and the sun and

darken the latter's face. In like manner the student of religious psychology is able to predict, from the known effects of certain teachings in the classrooms of psychology and philosophy, that when the student turns to religious thought that portion of his mental sky which ought to be most brilliantly illuminated will be mechanically obscured. Much time and pains must be expended in straightening out the perverse epistemology into which these young minds have been betrayed. They must be freed from the theory of knowledge and the conception of verification in which all unconsciously they have been indoctrinated.

An adequate Christian apologetic cannot begin with any formal presentation of its arguments, else it will be subjected to the futility of presenting arguments of undoubted weight and force to minds mechanically and hermetically sealed against them. We must begin with a thorough, adequate, convincing presentation of the nature of thought, the range and limitations of knowledge, the constitution and application of reason. We must include within the range of our apologetic method a presentation of the process of verification. This has often been recognized in a sporadic way before. More than twenty-five years ago an able teacher of theology wrote as follows: "In attempting to answer the questions which his rational study of Christianity suggests, the student is forced back on questions which reach to the profoundest depths of human thought. Among these are questions as to the reality, the processes, and the possible sphere of human knowledge; the principles and laws of thought * * *." Unfortunately this necessity of raising the previous question, as to the nature of

¹Harris, *Philosophical Basis of Theism*, p. 2.

knowledge, has not widely commended itself to our religious writers. Our apologetic writings have been saturated with the notion which really guarantees the position of empirical agnosticism, that "the fundamental difficulties of knowledge do not begin till the frontier is crossed which divides physics from metaphysics, the natural from the supernatural, the world of 'phenomena' from the world of 'noumena,' positive 'experience' from religious dreams."

Let this contention once be granted and the religious position is practically surrendered beforehand. We have been trying to make war on the enemy's terms. The whole agnostic position depends upon a theory of knowledge which breaks the force of evidence and allows no place for religion save the vague, bleak, uncharted regions of the unknown. This point is so vital that it is worth while to delay our direct consideration of the process of verification long enough to examine two striking historical instances in illustration of the truth for which we are now contending, namely, that Christian apologetics cannot ignore the problem of knowledge, and must force the fighting by challenging the epistemological positions which afford shelter and support to agnosticism.

Our first illustration is the case of John Stuart Mill. This English philosopher, who entered the arena of discussion and debate fully equipped as to method, system, and dialectic at the age of twenty, was the exponent on its theoretical side of the inductive scientific method. It has often been pointed out, and demands no emphasis here, that the mind of Mill was artificially constructed—formed according to the ideas of his father by a peculiar system of education.

¹Balfour, *Theism and Humanism*, p. 142.

It is not always so clearly recognized, however, that Mill's philosophical conclusions almost to the last iota were implicit in his theory of knowledge. Petersen says: "It was not the education which gave him his spiritual character, but the platform on which he was placed, and from which his education prevented him ever to free himself." That platform, that "stand-point," "was that of his father, that of Jeremy Bentham, that of the French encyclopedists—the baldest materialism" (Schaff-Hertzog, ed. 1883).

This is of course strictly correct. Our contention is that materialism was the *result* of Mill's thinking, not its starting point or precondition, and not only its result but its foredoomed and inevitable result in view of the premises. Given Mill's epistemological theory, no logical mind could possibly avoid materialism.

The scarcely veiled confession of the autobiography, that there was something in religion beyond his ability to understand, is pathetic evidence that he was by a false method of education robbed of an essential part of his inheritance as a man. Mill (in spite of his *Three Essays on Religion*) was never really allowed to think on religion because he was never allowed by his invincible theory of knowledge to make it a part of his experience. Mill was an empirical philosopher, with one entire hemisphere of experience automatically closed to him. Shut up within the range of sense perception to the extent of denying the ontological reality even of the perceiving mind, is it any wonder that he found himself unable to understand the rational possibility of religion? Among many illustrations which might be adduced to indicate the prescriptive hold upon his mind of this theory of knowledge perhaps the most

*See Mill on Hamilton, Vol. I, p. 253.

suggestive is furnished by Mill's attitude toward mathematics. In the autobiography (p. 225 ff.) occurs this passage, which may be duplicated in the *Logic*, in explanation of his antagonism to mathematics: "The chief strength of this false (intuitional) philosophy in morals, politics, and religion lies in the appeal which it is accustomed to make to the evidence of mathematics and the cognate branches of physical science. To expel it from these is to drive it from its stronghold." Hence the denial of *a priori*, or self-evident, truths and the assertion that all general principles are deposits of observation. Hence also the suggestion of a hypothetical world in which two and two make five. It would scarcely be possible, in the light of this instance, to overestimate the power of a theory of knowledge to dictate the results of our thinking.

Our second illustration is the intellectual career of one who might easily have been a disciple and follower of Mill, but who actually became one of the most trenchant and destructive critics of his principles and methods. We refer, of course, to the Rt. Hon. Arthur James Balfour, ex-Premier of Great Britain. In less than a dozen pages of his Gifford Lectures, on Theism and Humanism (pp. 140-151), Mr. Balfour gives us one of the most fascinating intellectual biographies recorded in the history of philosophy. We have already quoted a sentence from this section of his discussion which touches upon the vital issue. The whole discussion is peculiarly worth while because it exhibits concretely the proper method of dealing with the contentions of agnosticism and the proper point at which the issue should be joined.

Mr. Balfour states that he found it impossible upon entering Cambridge as an undergraduate to accept the

teachings of the prevalent school because of his radical antagonism to its leading principle.' He says: "For my own part, I feel now, as I felt in the early days of which I am speaking, that the problem of knowledge cannot properly be sundered in this fashion. Its difficulties begin with the convictions of common sense, not with remote, or subtle or other worldly speculations; and if we could solve the problem in respect of the beliefs which, roughly speaking, everybody shares, we might see our way more clearly in respect of beliefs on which many people are profoundly divided."

He refers with wonder to the dogmatic assurance of the empirical school as represented by Mill and Leslie Stephen (the author of *An Agnostic's Apology*), who refer with perfect confidence to experience (meaning thereby physical or phenomenal experience) as the one and sufficient ground of assurance. Mr. Stephen quotes with approval Locke's aphorism about believing in proportion to the evidence one has.' According to the view of this entire school, experience as defined above is the court of final resort. On this basis we may avoid controversy, be philosophic and religious agnostics, and at the same time be scientists dwelling at peace in a structure of ordered, satisfying, and indisputable knowledge.

Mr. Balfour retorts with finality: "The field of experience is no well-defined region under whose clear skies useful knowledge flourishes unchallenged, while the mist-enshrouded territories of its metaphysical neighbors are devastated by unending disputations. On the contrary it is the very battlefield of philosophy, the cockpit of metaphysics, strewn with abandoned

¹Op. cit., p. 143.

²Cf. Orr, *Christian View of God and the World*, p. 80, note 1.

arguments, where every strategic position has been taken and retaken, to which every school lays formal claim, which every contending system pretends to hold in effective occupation. * * * All men nowadays speak well of experience. They begin to differ only when they attempt to say what experience is, to define its character, to explain its credentials, and expound its message. But, unhappily, when this stage is reached their differences are endless" (p. 148). Mr. Balfour's escape from the maze of agnosticism was through the recognition of the *petitio principii* which closed the discussion even before it began.

We offer no apology, therefore, for a brief and rather crudely elementary study of the process of verification, with some slight reference to the specific application of it to the Christian system.

There are five principles which it is necessary for us to remember in all study of the process of verification:

First. There is no essential difference between belief and knowledge. "I suppose," "I think," "I believe," "I know"—in these four phrases are expressed with some degree of accuracy the stages of intellectual certitude involved in our progressive attainment of truth. The lines of demarcation between these various levels are a little wavering and uncertain; there are foothills both coming and going, but on the whole they express gradations of assurance which are sufficiently marked and distinct for all practical purposes.

It will be seen at once that the entire structure of this discussion is erected around the words, "I believe." It will also be clear upon reflection that the four familiar phrases used above center in the words "I

believe." The element of belief is common to them all, and they express degrees of confidence or stages in belief.

When I say "I suppose," my words imply an assumption of truth for argument's sake (see dictionaries) or, more commonly, in ordinary speech, a low degree of probability in favor of a conclusion reached in view of the general situation.

When I say "I think," I mean to express a degree of confidence in a certain conclusion, based upon thoughtful consideration of it to the extent of affirming a preponderance of evidence in its favor. When, however, I say "I believe," I express a state of mental rest in the conviction that a given thing is true.

Finally, in the phrase, "I know," I express the highest degree of certainty attainable to me. I imply complete and satisfactory certification.

The first thing that strikes one in viewing these affirmations is, that in the words "I know" I can actually express nothing more than is conveyed by the words "I believe," for the reason that constitutionally I can affirm nothing more than the subjective persuasion of truth. We can distinguish belief from knowledge only when our beliefs are held with reservation—for we know only by and through believing. We can maintain the validity of objective knowledge by an act of faith in the intelligibility of experience and the trustworthiness of the faculties by which we organize experience into knowledge. In the very nature of the case, this antecedent possibility of attaining truth must be assumed and granted. It cannot be proved, for we have no instrument for proving other than that whose trustworthiness is already in question. Mind cannot

verify itself, inasmuch as it is itself the verifier. If the assumption that mind may be trusted be refused, the whole discussion of knowledge becomes futile as well as unmanageably complex. We are quite content, for the purpose of discussion, to assume the reality of knowledge in the sense in which it is ordinarily accepted as the basis of thought and action.

In making this assumption, which is quite sensible, inasmuch as we cannot hope to do without it, it is necessary only to point out, as we are now doing, that our entire structure of knowledge rests upon a foundation of assumption and is simply a strong form of belief. Knowledge which rests upon belief is no stronger than the belief upon which it rests.

An unrealized or suppressed premise of all logical processes is the trustworthiness of reason. The critical scrutiny of our knowledge and knowing processes always turns upon the assumption of our competence to criticise. Another premise of the same sort is the coherence and intelligibility of experience. These are assumptions which cannot be proved because they are the very instruments of proof. They can be justified and confirmed only as they are put to the test of experiment and are verified in the actual business of living and thinking. Knowledge, therefore, consists of beliefs sufficiently tested to bear the weight put upon them in practice. In moving through conjectures to beliefs, and onward through beliefs to certainties, we advance without crossing any absolute boundaries of difference in kind. Knowledge is certified belief. In all the process of our thinking and knowing, and throughout all our successive stages of verification, nothing can ever be quite so sure as the instruments of our assurance, the unproved assumptions with which

we start out. These are: That our experience is coherent and intelligible, and that we have in mind an instrument which, when brought into contact with the reality through experience, can attain to truth. In the final analysis, therefore, truth is self-witnessing. As Professor Ladd has put it: "No certification of knowledge is possible that is not somehow found actually existent within the process of cognition itself."

Second. Mind is co-extensive with experience; that is, there is no non-mental experience. In the final analysis all experience is mental experience. Mind is the central, supreme, and determinative reality. The self as perceiving and organizing agent is the only immediate object of knowledge. What we call (and rightly call) "objective reality" is given to us only in the form of mental experience and in the terms of mind. We know nothing of an objective world, which includes our own sensations, save as mental phenomena, objectified with reference to their cause by a native and irresistible impulse. This objectifying process is justifiable as an operation of mind only on the basis of faith in the trustworthiness of our mental operations.

One side of our mental experience we call nature, and interpret in terms of cause, substance, space, and time. Our experience, in which is included that broadened and generalized type of experience which we gain through reflection and communication with other minds, is an absolute and indivisible unity of thought, within which the only recognizable duality is that of subject and object. On their inner side all these facts which we term objective are mental. The conclusion

*Philosophy of Knowledge, p. 105.

is that on their outer side they are also in some sense mental. The practical outcome of this experimental fact is that the entire world of our experience lies within the mind and in the form of ideas, and that those facts of which we are apt to speak strictly in terms of the idea (our moral and spiritual ideals, for example) are not less objective and concrete than those other ideas of which we speak in physical terms. They are operations of the same faculties; they are parts of the same experience; they are referable to like causes; they are verifiable on exactly the same basis. We shall not allow ourselves to be cut off from the verification of that part of our experience which belongs to the spiritual realm, on the ground that a higher certainty belongs to another aspect of experience which is itself constituted in mind and in mind alone. To say that our physical experience only is objective, in the sense of extra-mental, is to say what is not true. To say that our ideals are self-imposed and capable of subjective verification only is not to discredit them. All verification is subjective. Our categories of interpretation, the constitutive laws of mind through which we know all reality, are subjective and self-imposed.

Third. Reason is limited by experience. Taking now into consideration that which is ordinarily meant by the term "reason" (that is, the ratiocinative faculty, as it is termed—the faculty by which we reach conclusions in the persuasion of truth), we at once perceive that it operates in experience and upon the material supplied by experience, and never apart. Reason gives us no knowledge save of its own processes, though it is the medium and condition of all possible knowledge. It is what the Germans call a purely formal faculty.

Reason can tell us nothing concerning the objective world save as that world is described in experience.

Logic, which is the science of reason, does no more, as has often been pointed out, than to assure us that we can think without self-contradiction; much less can it, out of its own resources and apart from experience, give us one fact concerning the external world. Rationality in its entirety is the possession of every rational being, but the possession of rationality is quite compatible with erroneous views as to the nature and constitution of objective reality. All experience is within the mind, but mind may misinterpret its own experience. The universe is larger than our experience, and experience is vastly larger than our rational interpretation of it. At any rate the mind cannot construe reality apart from contact with it in experience. Those are conclusions as to objective reality, and are never final, even though on the basis of experience they are necessary. They are in constant process of revision as experience accumulates and knowledge grows. The function of reason, therefore, is to determine the significance of experience as it is translated into modes of consciousness.

Fourth. Belief is the outcome of a strictly rational process. The words "I believe" register the conclusion arrived at by a process of reasoning. We believe with the reason; we have no other faculty by which we can believe. We may believe on insufficient grounds, or on what seem to others insufficient grounds; but we cannot believe on no grounds at all. This involves no denial that there is such a thing as the "will to believe." But the will to believe does not imply forcing one's self to believe contrary to evidence, but simply that the will may throw its weight in favor of a given conclu-

sion which might otherwise remain uncertain. A man believes because he must. In the presence of facts truly presented and rightly understood, the operation of reason is absolutely and infallibly automatic. In the absence of a correct knowledge of the facts, wrong conclusions (because of the trustworthiness of reason) are unavoidable. We are all well aware, of course, that prejudice warps our judgment, and that feeling controls to a very great extent the operations of reason. In the former instance prejudice may induce a man to refuse reason the opportunity to come into contact with the facts, but it cannot control the reasoning process itself. I may refuse to consider facts which are presented to me, but if once I do consider them my conclusions are reached by virtue of the compelling force in the facts themselves. In the latter instance feeling controls reason only by effecting a change in the valuation of facts. We reach conclusions, not merely by recognizing bare, unadorned facts, but partly by estimating their value. Feeling may impose an artificial value upon facts, and by this false coloring mislead reason. We may, under certain circumstances, fabricate experience or imagine facts, and thus reduce our reasoning powers to a minimum or mislead them altogether; but this does not change the fact that belief is the outcome of a rational process.

Fifth. Belief may reasonably extend beyond the range of experimental verification. All the great generalizations of science are in the nature of extended beliefs that transcend the very possibility of detailed verification. The application of the inductive method in detail to the entire universe is, of course, out of the question. We can, of necessity, observe but a very limited portion of the facts. Yet on the basis of their

convictions as to the unity of nature, the universality of law (itself of course a postulate), and the intelligibility of the entire world process, scientists do not hesitate to make generalizations which include within their embrace an immense number of unknown and perhaps unknowable facts of the universe. It ought not to be forgotten that such generalizations, however reasonable and convincing, involve the truly stupendous assumption that in the comparatively narrow range of experience possible to us, even when we extend and refine it through careful experimentation and the use of instruments of precision, we have a disclosure of the essential nature of things, an authentic glimpse of reality which enables us to think securely in realms indefinitely beyond the range of our senses or of these instruments of precision. And this leads to the remark that the world of scientific exactness is abstract rather than real, an ideal construction and creation of the mind rather than one of actual physical realization. We have no instruments of absolute precision; we can, therefore, take no absolutely accurate measurements. We have no correctly given fixed points from which measurements can be made. We have to idealize the world in order to bring it completely under subjection to the scientific method. From the point of view of abstract dynamics, fixed points and immutable foundations are needed, but there are no such except within the mind—"the earth is the scene of incessant convulsions, and the fixed stars are like a swarm of flies." The writer of these words goes on to say: "The costliness of the devices to eliminate terrestrial oscillations in certain attempts at experimental precision, and the elaborate calculations to unravel the 'proper motions' of the less distant

stars, are plain evidence of the truth of this seemingly extravagant statement.”

It is no reflection upon the work of the scientist to say that it is conceived and executed in the workshop of the mind, and that its perfection and finish are due to tools finer than those of sense. The significance of the world lies in its relationship to mind. Its meaning consists of its fundamental ideality. The ponderable realities of outward experience are essentially thought-forms, else we should not be able to know the world at all. In this outward experience we lay hold upon ontological reality simply because it is a part of the life of the mind wherein we reach directly and know at first hand essential being. It is quite legitimate for the scientist, on the basis of a profound conviction as to the structural unity of nature, to generalize from incomplete data—to judge the whole from a very small part. But it ought not to be forgotten that it is not a strictly logical process. The spectroscope proves the presence of familiar metals and gases in distant stars, provided it be assumed that the same effects always indicate the same causes, or, what amounts to the same thing, that the presence of a new cause will of necessity produce a new effect. We believe firmly in the testimony of the spectroscope, for without such beliefs (which are incapable of proof unless the assumed premise be granted) science would be impossible.

It is quite evident, therefore, that into the most severe and exact science, bound to the inductive method and reaching its conclusions step by step through the most painstaking experimentation, a large element of faith—unproved trust—is infused at the very begin-

¹Ward, *Naturalism and Agnosticism*, Vol. 1, p. 78. See whole chapter.

ning of the process. Faith has been well called the "torch of science," without which investigation is impossible. Even natural law is "a hypothesis, a postulate, an epistemological precondition of the possibility of scientific experience, but not itself a fact of experience." As the author of these words also says: "Such a statement involves no disparagement of science." We believe in natural law, once it is properly understood and defined, just as we believe in nature itself, because we trust the operations of mind.

We are now prepared to summarize the possibility of verification as preliminary to the specific application of it. The process of acquiring knowledge, or the progressive establishment or verification of our beliefs, consists of two operations which are distinct and yet necessarily move forward together. The first is the training of the mind as an instrument of intellectual precision. The second is the progressive enlargement of experience. Mental training is an essential element in the gaining of knowledge. The laws of reason are universal and inexorable; the operations of the mind are spontaneous and in natural harmony with reason. None the less man has to learn the use of his own mind. The obvious difference between the untrained mind, with its loose and inexact ways of thinking, and the trained mind, so swift and sure in action, is evidence enough of the necessity of this process. The very first of the objective realities which man encounters in his movement outward upon the world are the laws and operations of his own mind. These he must learn in order to know the world itself. To be sure, he learns to know them by using them, but back of all mental operations, and furnishing the motive power to thought, are the impulses of self-

expression and self-preservation, which are the primary and elementary impulses of life. Man thinks and learns because he lives, and wishes to live abundantly. His mind is the instrument of his life, and in living he learns to use his mind. The process of his enlightenment is, so far, the progressive development of his mental powers and the application of them to experience. But this is not all. In addition, the voluntary enlargement and enrichment of experience are necessary. Because he wills to know, man becomes the investigator and experimenter. He seeks to enlarge the area of his experience, and endeavors with infinite toil to penetrate beneath the surface of it. He breaks into the experience of other men, and enlarges both his intelligence (by combining it with that of others) and his experience (through the same combination), until there comes to be a racial mind and a racial experience, or, to be more exact, a collective mind which expresses the deepest experience and most careful thinking of the race.

When we review the field of verification in the light of the foregoing principles we are able to designate, with somewhat greater precision than at the beginning, the degrees of certainty to which we are able to attain.

A. At the foundation of all certainty, securely imbedded in the nature of reason itself, are the postulates of reason, which are principles laid down in advance of all thinking as the prerequisites of the thought process itself. These are incapable of proof, and independent of it. They rest upon a basis of self-witness more secure than any issue of the reasoning process can possibly be, inasmuch as they condition that process itself.

B. Next to these postulates come necessary or universal truths. These are ideas also wrought out of the nature of reason itself, the contrary of which cannot be thought without self-contradiction. These necessary ideas form the apparatus of demonstration. We demonstrate by the application of necessary ideas to concrete items of experience. Demonstration is possible only where our knowledge is exhaustive. The process is dependent upon the universality of the premises upon which it proceeds. No inductive process which does not, extensively and intensively, involve complete knowledge can give more than relative certainty. For the most part our demonstrations are limited by our ability to make premises by definition. No matter how certain our logical processes may be, if the premises are uncertain the outcome is infected with this primary uncertainty.

C. Next to necessary truths comes that body of common experience which remains relatively constant, whatever our views may be of its ultimate nature. What we call the external world, the phenomenal side of experience, is relatively a stable object of thought, and is, as an element of experience, constant and reliable. The subject matter of the descriptive sciences is found here. Science, apart from its theory, is a careful definition and orderly statement of our phenomenal experience, a large part of which is at once common to the race at large and to the relatively small body of scientific observers. Science collects, arranges into groups, classifies according to general principles, and describes for purposes of identification certain facts which belong to the world of experience in which all men live. The common and universal quality of

this experience is one element of our security in the process of building up scientific beliefs.

D. Next in order come probabilities—beliefs based upon a greater or less preponderance of evidence in their favor. Among these conclusions resting upon probability, which Butler claims to be the guide of life, are scientific hypotheses—theoretical constructions framed to explain related groups of facts. Speculations as to origins, the attempt to discover genetic connections in the process of development, theories of matter and energy all belong to the class of tentative beliefs, probable in proportion to the number of facts which they explain, but not final nor absolute in the face of incomplete knowledge of the data involved.

E. Individualized experience, which is peculiar to the subject of it and can reach others only by verbal communication, is dependent upon historical testimony. Individualized experience which involves common factors accessible to all may pass into immediate verification by the process of experiment along the lines of the original experience. A man, even in his most unique and individual experiences, may be simply a pioneer along the pathway of experience in which others may follow after him. Historical testimony, therefore, is of two kinds: That which is open to repeated experiment and therefore continuously and universally verifiable, and that which is private and self-enclosed to the individual who first knows it. This becomes credible only on the basis of confidence in the testimony of the witness.

We may now briefly suggest the concrete application of these general principles to the verification of Christianity. The Christian religion is, in essence, a mode of approach to God historically conditioned by

the person of Jesus Christ as disclosed in the New Testament and as now living and working in the lives of men. It is, therefore, in the final analysis, an interpretation of human life in and through the historic and living Christ. "What made the [Christian] religion was the significance His person had for thought, the way in which it lived for faith, the mode in which it interpreted to reason God and the universe, man, and history. * * * It is by virtue of this idea that we have the Christian religion, and that it has lived and reigned from the moment of its birth until now."

The verification of Christianity belongs primarily to the sphere of psychology and history. In other words, the appeal is to the facts of human nature and human experience. In verifying the vital principle of Christianity, which affirms the continued presence and living influence of Christ, the immediate appeal is also to consciousness in its specifically Christian form. If there is competent evidence to show that the key to the essential meaning of human nature and human life is to be found in Christ, our positive and constructive proof is complete. In other words, if it can be shown, historically, that men consciously need and are consciously experiencing access to God in Christ, then, on the basis of an intelligent conception of the meaning of human nature, Christianity is vindicated. But this positive and constructive proof has certain historic implications which react in the most decisive way upon our general conception of the constitution of man and the nature and possibilities of human experience. It is quite evident that the differential quality of Christian experience lies in the con-

*Fairbairn, *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, p. 478.

tinuity which it assumes between the past and the present, conceived of as centering in the experience of reconciliation with God through Christ. This interpretation identifies the Christ of history and of experience. "It is a distinctive mark of the Christian religion that it blends together inseparably the historical and spiritual." The writer just quoted says: "Clearly such a faith [the basis of Christian experience] which is a spiritual act has its roots in history and that in two ways. First, our conception of what Christ is as the indwelling life of the church, and of the individual soul, derives its content from His earthly character and work. Secondly, He Himself possesses His present power to deliver and renew us because He was once a sharer in the moral struggle of our race, and came forth from it victorious."

The vindication of this inward and spiritual element in the Christian life is inseparably connected with the verification of the historical. It is true that the fact of Christian experience, the central principle of which is a conscious relationship to the living Christ, bears heavily in favor of its historical implications; but that experience is so manifestly based upon historical considerations that separate attention must be given to these. It is evident that the connection between the historical and the spiritual elements in Christianity is established in a series of unprecedented physical events. The mysteries of the Incarnation, the Resurrection, and the Ascension are essentially transitional and connective events, bringing together and uniting the historical and the spiritual elements in the Christian religion. These alleged events bring Christianity under observation by the scientific mind, and dictate

*Forrest, *The Christ of History and Experience*, p. 3f.

in a measure our mode of procedure in vindication of its rationality.

We are not now attempting a proof, merely indicating the sphere within which the proof must be conducted. In the first place, we must remind ourselves that Christianity claims to be a rational system. It makes much of belief, and emphasizes strongly the necessity of faith as an organ of spiritual vision. As we have seen, however, faith (that is, trust beyond the range of experiment) is an element in all reasoning processes. Christianity admits the unprecedented nature of the events which it alleges in the career of Christ, but maintains that the belief in these events is entirely reasonable because they are supported by many infallible proofs. It assumes the ability of the mind to know the truth concerning God, indeed to know God Himself. It assumes the inviolability of natural law to the extent of affirming that any breach in the continuity of natural processes involves the immediate agency of the Supreme Cause. It maintains the essential unity of the natural and the supernatural by affirming that the unique person and career of Jesus reveal the inner and spiritual meaning of the world process itself. "In him all things stand together." As far as physical science and theory are concerned, Christianity (including its miraculous elements) is entirely compatible with any interpretation of nature which is in harmony with known facts of conscience and personality. It is entirely congenial to any one of a thousand conceivable theories as to the ultimate constitution of matter, the nature of energy, and the phases of cosmic change through which the universe has passed. As long as these theories keep within the sphere of physical facts and the legitimate

inferences drawn from these, Christianity has no quarrel with them.

One concession which science is compelled to make in its own interests Christianity demands. The centrality and primacy of man in his own world of experience, and the essential harmony between the human mind and the experience which centers in that mind, must be allowed. Without this primary confidence science is impossible. Having made, as we have said, this concession in its own interest, science cannot take it back by erecting the physical order, considered not in its actual and concrete reality as given in experience, but abstractly and imaginatively as something apart from mind, into a false primacy which reduces mind to shadow and unreality. The fundamental fallacy of materialism in all its forms lies in our utter inability to know or even to conceive of a world lying apart from mind. The creative pre-eminence of mind is the first principle of science, which can never be revoked by science except at the cost of self-destruction. The ultimate trustworthiness of self-consciousness as disciplined in the school of experience is the first corollary of the principle on which all scientific investigation proceeds. This principle once granted, Christianity has a free hand to organize the testimony of experience in favor of its view of the world, and in so doing is the legitimate heir of all that science has done to give fulness and richness of meaning to those organizing ideas of unity, order, and law which are the formative elements of any harmonious and intelligent conception of the meaning of experience. The simple and undeniable fact that belief in Christianity does not compel one to any specific type of scientific theory, but is equally compatible with any one of many

which is in harmony with the principles to which science is irrevocably committed, makes possible the spiritual interpretation of all physical facts, and the hearty participation of Christian thinkers in building up that structure of knowledge upon which science is engaged.

The verification of the exceptional historical elements which enter into the Christian Gospel lies in a region outside the range of science. Physical science has no apparatus with which to recognize or identify a miracle. For science, a miracle is merely an unclassifiable physical event. By definition, it is an event without an immediate physical antecedent. For science, this is an event beyond the range of its methods of explanation. Such an event can be catalogued with other events: "Not yet classified or explained." It differs from other members of its class only in the fact that it can never be explained by any formula which science has at its disposal.

On the other hand, science has no apparatus with which to controvert either the possibility or the actuality of miracles. The only actual principle which science can apply to universal experience is the law accepted as a postulate that the same cause will always produce the same effects. All its predictions regarding the future, as well as all its speculative reconstructions of the unknown past, rest upon the proviso, *ceteris paribus*. It has nothing to say concerning the results which may have followed in the past, or may follow in the future, the operation of new causes, except to affirm that they must necessarily be different. Unless science is prepared, however, to commit itself to the "eternal regress" in the phenomenal succession, it must somewhere in that succession come upon a physical fact that has no physical antecedents. Origination is

miracle. Unless, too, one is prepared to look upon the world both as cause and effect in which the succession of events is bound together by a mechanical necessity (an altogether gratuitous and ambiguous supposition), he must admit that every event has antecedents which are not physical. Every physical event partakes to some extent of the character of a miracle, and the totality of connected events in the series which makes up the world process is one gigantic miracle.

The nescience in which all science ends, in the attempt to frame ultimate physical explanations of the world, simply shows the limits of the method. The encircling and impassable wall of the unknown by which all the physical sciences are surrounded exhibits the fact that no further progress is possible in that direction. The frontier of all investigation by physical methods runs on the hither side of final explanations. Science cannot be commandeered on either side in the battle of world-views. The attitude of incredibility, in so far as it represents hostility to stubborn and unclassifiable facts, is essentially unscientific. The first step in scientific education is to divest one's self of antecedent prejudices so as to yield complete obedience to the actual world order as presented to us in experience. As we have already seen, reason can give us no objective fact. No amount of abstract reasoning could give us beforehand the number of quills in a bird's wing or the length in miles of the orbit of Neptune. Such items of information can be gained only by observation or by inference from other known facts. The objective experience out of which science is built up has very little regard for antecedent probabilities. Our very sense of what is possible is continually under assault by the facts of the natural order. One who

looks upon any cycle of experience as completed and closed, and consequently as a criterion of probability, is likely to be forced into an attitude of blind antagonism to indisputable facts. Many of these facts are (at least when first seen, and often permanently) on the face of them inherently incredible.

The exceptional historical events of Christianity are no more inherently incredible than any other exceptional events which defy classification according to the methods and tests of physical science. Professor Huxley has said: "The mysteries of the church are a child's play compared with the mysteries of nature."¹⁰ Why then such obdurate skepticism concerning Christian history? In Professor Huxley's case, simply because he would not admit that spiritual view of things in connection with which the wonders of Christianity become harmonious and consonant elements of one great system. The agnostic, he says, rejects theology "simply because in his judgment there would be no evidence sufficient to warrant the theological propositions even if they related to the commonest and most every-day propositions." This means that the evidence for the miracles of Christianity would not be sufficient to prove them if they were not exceptional events at all. It also means that evidence enough to prove these events, if they were not miraculous, would be enough to prove them as miracles. The upshot of the whole matter is that the difficulty of miracles is not the improbability of these events as such, but the implication of spiritual causality immediately behind them. It amounts to the refusal to consider the evidence at all, on the ground that no evidence to prove the real point at issue can be found.

¹⁰See Gore's *Incarnation, etc.*, p. 266.

This instance is cited simply to support the contention that the exceptional nature of the historical contents of the Christian Gospel does not outlaw it from the realm of rational explanation, provided one admits other evidences than those of the senses, and other tests than those of physical science. Science, acting within its own legitimate sphere, can interpose no *a priori* bar (as Professor Huxley admits) to belief in the historicity of the Gospel narrative. Science, as such, is agnostic in regard to miracles, not because they are any more inherently incredible than other physical events, but because the only possible explanation of them carries one immediately into a world of reality not accessible by the scientific laboratory method. The fact that this supersensible world of reality (which is behind miracles, not only, but all events alike) is not accessible by the method of physical science is no proof of its non-existence unless it be affirmed that our only instruments of knowledge are those used in the investigation of physical data. This we take to be an altogether false, irrational, and misleading conception of knowledge, which in the ultimate outcome is quite as fatal to science as to religion.

The special manifestation of this world of the unseen on the platform of visible history in a series of exceptional events, such as are alleged by Christianity as proofs that such a movement from the unseen to the seen has taken place, is by no means inherently incredible and is susceptible of the strongest rational vindication. At the center of a converging network of inter-related evidences which indicate the divine origin of the Christian religion stands the unique, unassailable figure of the Christ who is Himself at once the supreme affirmation and the inexpugnable

proof of Christianity. To refuse, to evidences like these, the right to be heard at the bar of reason is to refuse to the sun the right to prove that day has dawned upon the earth.

“And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of an only begotten from a father) full of grace and truth.”

NEW YORK.

CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY

By HERMAN BAVINCK, Theol. D., Professor of Dogmatics and Apologetics,
Free University, Amsterdam

(Translated by Rev. A. A. Pfanstiehl)

As HAS often been remarked, there is between Christianity and all other religions one prominent characteristic and real difference. We can notice this in the minor religions; for, although they recognize a Highest Being called the Great Spirit, the Exalted Father, the Mighty Lord, yet this is generally a dead belief, especially among the common people. All these religions drift in practice into animism and fetichism, into superstition and sorcery. But all the higher religions differentiate themselves from Christianity in one chief point. They without doubt have various noble characteristics, so that they do not stand in exclusive antithesis to Christianity, but afford the missionary many points of contact, and in all these grades of affinity must not be repelled but won and strengthened. Yet they have a distinctive and entirely different character than the Christian religion and indicate this mainly in the place and significance which they assign to their founders. Zoroaster in the Persian, Confucius in the Chinese, Gautama in the Buddhist, and Mohammed in the Islam religion are indeed greatly talented and were later also honored as more or less deified persons who had marked out a definite way of salvation, but each individual must after all travel that way for himself and is finally his own saviour. All these religions are, according to the characterization of Ed. von Hartmann, auto-soteric.

However, in the Christian religion, Christ is, as it were, Christianity. He once lived upon earth not only

to leave behind His precepts and example so that He returning could be fully satisfied if Christianity simply ruled in the heart, even though He Himself might be entirely forgotten (J. G. Fichte), but He is the living Lord who now sitteth at the right hand of God and continues the work of redemption through His Word and Spirit. In this particular all the articles of faith in the above named religions contain a different meaning, as well about God and the world as about man, his sin, his redemption, and his destiny. The Chinese religion is deistic, the Buddhist atheistic, the Persian dualistic, the Mohammedan fatalistic.

In none of these is there a true conception of God's holiness and of the nature of sin, of the work of redemption, and of the development and completion of God's kingdom. The love of the Father, the grace of His Son, and the communion of the Holy Spirit are unknown to them all. And that we are able to judge all these religions in this manner from a higher point of view—acknowledging the good in them and pointing out that which is erroneous and weak in them—we have to thank Christianity, which also proves itself thereby to be the true religion, the correction and completion of all religions.

From the very beginning, therefore, the confession that Jesus was the Son of God formed the foundation of the church (Matt. 16:13-18). The answer to the question: "What think ye of Christ?" marked a difference between the friends and the enemies of Jesus (Matt. 22:42), and from the confession that Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God and the Saviour of the world did the church and the history of dogma take their rise. Just as the disciples of Jesus already at Antioch received the name of Christians (Acts

11:26) and in public gave the impression that they revered Him as God (Pliny) were they themselves also clearly conscious that they thought of Christ as of God, as the Judge of the quick and the dead (Clemens). But at the formulation of this confession all manner of difficulties arose, and the reef of Ebionism (Judaism) on the one side and of Gnosticism (ethnicism) on the other had to be avoided; since, according to the former belief, Jesus was simply—especially at His baptism—entrusted with rich talents, a glorified and deified person; according to the latter, He was a temporary, heavenly, deified being appearing in human flesh.

Under the leadership of men such as Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, and others the church sailed safely between these two reefs and gradually came to the settled confessions of the councils, viz., that the Christ, as the eternal and only begotten Son of God, had, in the fulness of time, taken the nature of man, from the Virgin Mary, in a unity of Persons. This confession became the central article of faith of the Christian churches, the common foundation upon which they to the present time are all built and acknowledge and esteem each other as Christian churches.

This was not a matter of indifference, much less of an abstract formula, but of the real existence of Christianity itself, of its absolute character, of its specific distinction from Judaism and heathenism, of the reality and finality of the Christ-given divine revelation, and hence also of the independent existence and individual life of the church. This conception of Christianity found its expression in the doctrine of the two natures. Although in this doctrine human frailty need not be denied, yet it teaches much better

than the view of Christ as being from below and from above, according to the flesh and the Spirit the historic reality and the idea, what Jesus really was and what the church possessed in Him. Justice was therefore done only when the Incarnation was in reality distinguished from and highly exalted above inspiration and inhabitation and when also Jesus as born from the fathers as to the flesh was confessed as God over all.

Around this Christological dogma there centered as a matter of course, as it were, a world-embracing and humanity-ruling confession. For this Christ was truly the Son of God who in the beginning created the world and had fashioned man in His own image. He was the mediator of redemption who had in His person and work reconciled and united the sin-cursed world with God, and after His ascension poured out His Spirit, so that through Word and sacrament He might gather a church and renew man and the world into a Kingdom of God.

Viewed from the subjective and anthropological side Christianity is thus, indeed, one among many religions, a confession of man. But that confession implies that God as Father, Son, and Spirit establishes a great work in the world. Christianity stands before the soul in its truth and holiness only when we view it from the objective theological side, and therein glorify that Godlike work wherein the Father reconciles His created but fallen world through the death of His Son, and recreates it by His Spirit into a Kingdom of God.

After that, in the unfolding of the ages, greatly varying ideas were formed concerning the essence of Christianity, particularly since the formal search for

that character was instituted after the eighteenth century. Up to that time no necessity for this was felt, because men rejoiced in the possession of Christianity and felt entirely at home in the characteristic conception which the church to which they belonged expressed in its confession. Christianity was for every one identical with that dogma, that cult, and that church government which he found in his own religious fellowship; whatever deviated from it was impure and mixed with more or less error.

But when, during and after the Reformation, the various confessions, churches, and sects constantly increased, another conception of Christianity gradually began to make a way for itself. The Reformed and Lutheran orthodoxy soon made a distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental articles of faith; the theologians of Helmstadt, with Calixtus as leader, returned to the apostolic creed; the so-called Bible theologians declared the New Testament doctrines, which they derived, as they thought, from an exegesis independent of the church's teaching, to be true Christianity; and the Deists and Rationalists were of opinion that Christianity consisted alone in those Scripture truths which agreed with reason and were discovered through reason, or at least could have been so found.

Since that time the conceptions concerning the nature of Christianity have endlessly increased. Because, first, the churches, sects, and religious societies have alarmingly multiplied in the nineteenth century and each one of them holds a particular view of Christianity and of the Person of Christ. And further there have been added various representations concerning religion proposed by the theologians and philosophers, historians and socialists, which have exercised

an influence in narrower or wider circles. We have but to recall Kant and Hegel, Schleiermacher and Ritschl, Gunkel and Troeltsch, Kautsky and Maurenbrecher, Green, John Caird, Josiah Royce—and one can fill out this list according to his own will. Most divergent answers are to-day given to the question as to the nature of Christianity. There are as many Christs preached as there are scholars or quasi-scholars. The condition seems to be so confusing and hopeless that not a few have become skeptics and declare truth to be undiscoverable.

Still in the struggles of the various opinions there are certain encouraging signs of agreement.

1. There is no church or trend of thought that identifies its conceptions of Christianity with the original Christianity itself. True, each party holds its own interpretation as the correct one, and defends it against all others, but nevertheless each church and each school of thought makes a distinction between the truth as it is in Jesus, and the view which it has received and which it has expressed in a faulty, fallible manner in its confession of faith. The Roman Catholic Church is an exception to this in so far as it attributes infallibility to the Pope and pronounces its doctrine as the only true and absolutely correct interpretation of the Gospel. And yet even it makes a distinction between Christ and the Pope as His representative, between the inspiration of the apostles and the assistance of the Holy Spirit which the head of the church enjoys. There is no one who, in principle, disputes the distinction between the truth of Scripture and the dogma of the church.

This remark is not without weight against those who call their private personal interpretation of the

Gospel the historical in distinction from the dogmatic, which they ascribe to the churches. The churches have also, indeed, justly and earnestly endeavored to give in their confessions as pure a description of the Gospel as was possible; and men, such as Harnack, e. g., who reject these conceptions and present an individual explanation, never advance any further than to give a representation of the original Gospel which in their own opinion deserves preference over the others. They do not, therefore, set *the* Gospel in the place of the ecclesiastical dogma, but never advance any further than to offer a *different conception* of the Gospel than that which is honored in the churches. The conflict is not, therefore, between dogmatic or historical interpretation, but involves only the question as to what was the original Christianity.

2. There exists in this also, furthermore, a strong agreement, viz., that the question as to the essence of Christianity becomes identical with that which concerns the original, genuine, and true Christianity, and that in order to learn to know this latter we must return to the Scriptures, particularly to the New Testament. There are really no other sources. The testimony of Josephus concerning Jesus is critically suspicious and contains nothing new; the slanders which the Jews since the middle of the second century brought forth to combat Christianity may have found acceptance with Celsus, Porphyrius, and in recent date with Haeckel, but they do not come into consideration in an earnest search after the original Christianity. The short utterances about Jesus and the Christians by Tacitus, Suetonius, and Pliny are in themselves, it is true, important and place the historical existence of Jesus beyond reasonable doubt; but they do not

increase our knowledge of original Christianity. And the many apocryphal gospels which arose in Ebionite and Gnostic circles betray a too prejudiced character to be considered as being of trustworthy source. Among the recently discovered precepts of Jesus there are but a few which perhaps did flow from His lips and were preserved pure in tradition. But with these few exceptions we have no other sources of knowledge of the life of Jesus than the books of the New Testament, and more particularly speaking the four Gospels. For that which is mentioned of that life in the other books of the New Testament is comparatively little and is substantially contained in these Gospels.

3. To this it is to be added that the long conflict over the genuineness and trustworthiness of the books of the New Testament and especially the Gospels has not at all led to a generally accepted result but yet has come to a certain point of rest. No one thinks for a moment to explain Christianity as it is accepted by the churches, and fundamentally expressed in their Christology, as having originated through Hellenistic or other foreign influences in the second century. The New Testament books, particularly the four main epistles of Paul, remain a protest against this, and could not have originated in or after that time. Consequently it is now quite universally acknowledged that the ecclesiastical Christology dates in substance from the first century and precedes the alleged Hellenistic influences on original Christianity. The reason for assigning to the second century the various New Testament books, herewith, at the same time, drops away. They have pretty nearly all been brought back successively by critics of note to the first century. In 1897 Harnack said that there was a time when the

oldest Christian literature was considered a tissue of deception and falsification, but that time is past; we are returning to the traditions. The chronological order in which tradition has arranged the documents of Christianity from the epistles of Paul to the writings of Irenæus is to be considered in all essentials correct. And this opinion of the Berlin professor has since that time been agreed to by the many.

Herewith naturally the center of gravity of the scientific research was shifted from literary criticism to *Religions-Geschichte*. For although the oldest churches, so far as we can trace their origin from sources at hand, confessed Jesus as the Christ, there still remained the possibility of these two interpretations, viz., that Christ was the product of the church, or the church the product of Christ. In the former case we must imagine something like this: That for a long time a group of religious persons existed, or perhaps had organized themselves under the influence of social circumstances, who united the various characteristics of the Christ image found in the New Testament with those from Jewish, Greek, Egyptian, Babylonian, or Indian sources, and applied these to a certain Jesus whose historical existence is questionable. Although this attempted explanation made progress for a while, it soon, however, proved to be vain. The Christ myth has already had its day, and firmer than ever does the historical existence of Christ stand among the circle of scholars.

But this existence alone is as little satisfactory to science as it is to the faith of the church. It is not a matter of concern only *that* Jesus was, but still more *what* He was. And research has certainly led to some result.

Indeed, just as little as the Gospels enabled a former generation to write a Life of Jesus which satisfied mind and heart, do they offer the critics of our day opportunity to return from the Christ of Scriptures to the so-called historical Christ. The attempt to remove all layers of soil so deeply that we come to stand upon the rock-bottom of reality has been a complete fiasco. The cry: From Paul and John back to Christ, back to the Jesus of the Synoptics, or particularly of the Sermon on the Mount, has proved to be a hollow sound because the Christ image in all the New Testament books is in substance the same. How could Paul in that case have arrived at his doctrine of Christ? How could he have found acceptance among the congregations with his so-called "falsification" of the original Gospels? And how could he have received the right hand of fellowship from the apostles in Jerusalem after he had explained his Gospel to them (Gal. 2:2-9) if in this fundamental article of belief he had cherished an entirely different thought, and thus had preached another Christ?

There was, it is true, a difference between Paul and certain brethren among the Jews, but this difference applied chiefly to consequences which flowed forth from the Gospel as concerning the Old Testament law. But concerning the Person of Christ, His life, death, resurrection, and second coming, there was no question. All apostles were in agreement on this point; of a Christological controversy there was no thought among them. The first three Gospels are derived from disciples of Jesus, i. e., of believers just as much as are the Gospel of John and the epistles of Paul. They were at least also written in a time when already a

number of congregations existed and for a public which had been instructed concerning the Person and work of Christ by apostles, and they did not proclaim any other Jesus as the Christ than was preached by *all* the apostles and was confessed by all believers of that day. It is *one* harmonious Christ image which the New Testament in all its books presents to us.

At the close of the fifteenth year of the reign of Emperor Tiberius (779 after the founding of Rome and 26-27 A.D.), when Herod Antipas was king of Galilee and Peræa and Pontius Pilate was procurator of Judea, there was a remarkable religious revival among the Jews. Suddenly there appeared a man out of the desert of Judea whose countenance bore the marks of an abstemious life, who wore no other clothes than a rough mantle of camel's hair fastened with a leathern girdle around his loins and who called all who would listen to him to repentance because the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand. With this preaching did John, later called the Baptist, tread in the footsteps of the old prophets who also had constantly urged their people to repent. But he enforced his exhortation with the prophecy that the long expected Kingdom of Heaven was at hand. The Old Testament had indeed taught that God is King of all the earth (Psalms 24; 29; Jer. 10:7, etc.), and that, since the establishment of His covenant at Sinai, He was in a special sense King of His people Israel (Isa. 33:22), but that kingship of God had been steadily less acknowledged on the part of the people, and was continually more earnestly withstood. If that kingship of God was ever to be realized, it could not be along the line of regular development, but it had to descend suddenly from above by a special gracious

and mighty deed of God, and hence it became more and more the prayer and at the same time the expectation of pious Israelites that God would open the heavens, and by His own descent reveal His righteousness and grace (Isa. 64:1, etc.).

Daniel especially worked out this idea: After the world kingdom will the Kingdom of God descend from above. The four world kingdoms which preceded it were like four beasts coming out of the sea, out of the world beneath, but after that would come a Kingdom represented as a stone hewn out of the mountain without hands, growing itself into a mountain, and that is the Kingdom which the God of Heaven will develop, which will not be hindered (Dan. 2:34, 35, 44, 45), and which will be given to the holy people (Dan. 7:18, 27) by the mediation of One who will come upon the clouds of the heavens in the likeness of a Son of Man (Dan. 7:13). Therefore did this Kingdom later receive the name of the Kingdom of Heaven, for was it not to come from above and descend out of Heaven upon earth? (Compare John 18:36.)

John the Baptist announced the imminence of that Kingdom and added that not the seed of Abraham, not circumcision, not righteousness according to the law, but conversion alone, change of mind, a religious-ethical renewal of heart opens entrance to that Kingdom. And he confirmed this by baptism which he administered to all who came to him with confession, as a sign and seal of their conversion and great grace of forgiveness which was both condition and meaning of the Kingdom of Heaven. John made a tremendous impression by this preaching. True, the Pharisees and Sadducees assumed a critical attitude toward him. They were, therefore, spoken to with strong language

and were threatened with judgment (Matt. 3:7-12), but the people streamed from all quarters to him, from Jerusalem and all Judea and the land around the Jordan, and were baptized by him, confessing their sins (Matt. 3:5, 6; 21:32).

Many from Galilee also came to him (Matt. 11:7-9), and among these was Jesus, the Son of Joseph and Mary, who was born in Bethlehem but brought up in Nazareth (Mark 1:9) and who came to John for the express purpose of being baptized by him (Matt. 3:13). This baptism had great significance not only for Jesus, but also for John. For up to this time he had declared as firmly as possible that he himself was not the Messiah, but that One stronger than he was to come after him, the latchet of whose shoes he was not worthy to unloose, and who would baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire (Matt. 3:13); but now at the baptism of Jesus he received the revelation that this was the Messiah. This general witness, which thus far was given by John and is to be found in the Synoptics, now received a special character and became a sign that Jesus was the Son of God and the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, as the Fourth Gospel particularly speaks of Him.

But this baptism also brought a turning point in the life of Jesus. Of His childhood and youth little is known. It is recorded only that He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, was circumcised the eighth day, and a few weeks later was presented to the Lord in the temple. Later He went annually with His parents to attend the feasts at Jerusalem, and as a lad of twelve years of age already testified that He must be about His Father's business (or in His Father's house).

However, soon after His baptism, which was the confirmation of His Sonship, the anointing with God's Spirit, and the qualification for His official work, He appeared in public among His own people. The word which He brought sounded the same as that of John: The fulness of time has come and the Kingdom of God is nigh at hand; repent and believe the Gospel, viz., of that Kingdom of God (Mark 1:15). That was the theme of His teaching, but He worked it out broader and deeper than had been possible with John or any of the prophets before him. The Kingdom of God is above all things a gift which came from above, and is given according to God's will to those for whom it was prepared from the foundation of the world, so that it can be received only in a childlike faith. However, it must at the same time be sought by man (not established by a moral life) and must be appreciated as a treasure or pearl above all price. In so far as it can thus be received here on earth, and the riches of that Kingdom, truth, righteousness, forgiveness of sins, peace, life, can be enjoyed, is it even now present. It realizes itself here on earth in proportion as Satan's power is destroyed. The Kingdom of God is, therefore, likened unto a seed and leaven which gradually develop. Yet it will be fully realized only in the future when the heirs receive eternal life in Heaven, partaking of the reward of their struggles and labor and shall all sit together at the feast prepared by the Father.

The only way which leads to and into that Kingdom for the continuous enjoyment of its blessings is that of faith and conversion, rebirth and self-surrender, cross bearing and following of Jesus. One must sacrifice all for that Kingdom, houses and lands, parents and children—even pluck out an eye and cut off

hand and foot if they become hindrances. It becomes the possession only of the pure in heart, the peace-makers, the merciful, etc. And these citizens of the Kingdom are but children, children of the Father who is in Heaven, and mutually brethren. Doing the will of God forms them into a new family, into a community separated from the world, who have but *one* Master and are led and ruled by the apostles in His name.

The most remarkable feature of the teaching of Jesus is, however, the place which He assigns to Himself in the Kingdom of Heaven. He is perfect and real man, who calls Himself mild and meek, who is dependent in all things on, and subject to, the Father, who again and again retires in solitude to seek strength in prayer. Day and hour of the future of God's Kingdom are not known by Him; places in that Kingdom are not under His but the Father's appointment; He Himself has come to serve and to suffer. At the same time there is as foundation in all His appearance and undertakings, in all His words and deeds, such a mighty and exalted self-consciousness that every one receives the impression that He stands far above all mankind. And this self-consciousness manifests itself in a self-witness which in any other person would suggest self-conceit. But this is noticeable, that He calls Himself meek and lowly of heart, without anyone daring to be offended by it. Although in all respects man He realizes Himself to be at all times more than man. Even as a lad of twelve years He is conscious of an inner fellowship with the Father and declares that He must be about His Father's business. And that fellowship is never interfered with or broken. Of falling and rising again, of stumbling and standing

again, there is with Him no thought. His prayers even in His deepest and heaviest suffering never contain a confession of sin, or any suing for forgiveness. He is greater than Jonah or Solomon, greater than the angels, and the temple. Blessed are the eyes that see what the disciples behold; the least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than John the Baptist, who yet was the greatest among those born of woman. He is Lord of the Sabbath and sets His "I say unto you" over against all scribes. He dispenses the riches of the Kingdom and has power to forgive sins, although this, according to the convictions of the Jews, belongs only to God. He goes about doing good, healing the sick and all ills among the people, and by the sheer power of His word raises the dead. In distinction from all servants He is the Father's Son, to whom is surrendered all that pertains to the realization of the Kingdom of God, and who only can lead to the Father and can receive into His fellowship. He is not only a prophet who testifies to the Kingdom of God, but He is its King who causes it to come through His works which He accomplishes by the Spirit of God, and who dispenses it to others even as it was given to Him by the Father. On the attitude which men assume toward Him depends their destruction or their salvation. Whosoever confesses Him before men will He confess before His Father in Heaven. Whosoever will be ashamed of Him and for His and the Gospel's sake does not leave all, cannot be His disciple and is not worthy of Him. He pronounces woes over Capernaum, Bethsaida, and Jerusalem, because they would not receive Him. After He had run His earthly course He is seated at the right hand of God, and will return upon the clouds of glory as Judge

of all the earth, to judge all, and to reward each one according to the deeds done in the body.

Further, this mighty self-consciousness that implies nothing less than that He stands in an entirely unique relation to the Father, and is His Son in a special sense, constitutes the basis of His Messiahship. It has, indeed, been argued in these latter days that Jesus did not announce Himself as being the Messiah, but that the church came to ascribe this title to Him only after its belief in His resurrection. But this opinion is contradicted by the facts in the case. We have but to bear in mind the entry into Jerusalem, the avowal of Jesus before the Sanhedrin and before Pilate, the mockery of the soldiers, the inscription above the cross, that certainly are not to be assigned by any criticism to the realm of fables. And not only later, at the end of His life or after the days of Cesaræa Philippi, did He become conscious of His Messiahship, but we meet with it on His part even when a lad of twelve years in the temple. He received the sign and seal of it at the baptism by John; in the temptation in the wilderness He resisted all seductions to misuse it; in the synagogue of Nazareth He applied to Himself the prophecy of the *Servant of the Lord*; and from the very beginning of His public appearance He referred to Himself as being the Son of Man.

It is now quite universally accepted that He derived the name, Son of Man, from Dan. 7:13, and this proves, in the first place, that Jesus considered Himself as being the Messiah promised in the Old Testament. But, in the second place, the fact that He took just this particular name, avoiding even the name of Messiah, King, indicates that He was and wanted

to be such in a different sense from that in which the Jews then in general expected their Messiah. He indeed did not come to establish an earthly kingdom, to take the place of commander in Israel, to destroy His enemies and exalt Himself to be the head of the nation. On the contrary He came to minister and give His soul a ransom for many, to seek and to save the lost, to be betrayed and crucified, and to establish a new covenant between God and man through His blood. Therefore He constantly calls Himself Son of Man whenever He speaks of His humiliation. In this humiliation He recognizes a divine "must"—a work appointed to Him by the Father, a way which He must tread in order to arrive at His glory.

An effort has often been made to banish from the original Gospel this divine necessity for suffering and death and hereby also remove the High-priestly and propitiatory significance of His death. But again without result. Not only does Jesus often speak of this at the end of His life, and at the Last Supper, but the facts afford still stronger evidence. He was condemned by the Sanhedrin, by the people, and by Pilate, because He claimed to be the Son of God and Israel's Messiah. The entire life and work of Christ lead to His death upon the cross, according to His own word and the record of the four Gospels; and this death is the deepest depth of His humiliation, the evidence of His full obedience to God's will, the establishment of a new covenant in His blood, the highest revelation of His and the Father's love for a sinful world, which thereby He reconciles and saves. Therefore even death had no power over Him; the third day He rose from the dead and entered into His glory. Often in those instances where He speaks of His

future glory He calls Himself Son of Man. He could be the Messiah, the Son of Man, who entered into His glory through suffering because He was the Son of God who stood in an entirely unique relation to the Father and remained true to His will even in the death upon the Cross.

This teaching of the Person and work of Christ, which purposely was taken only from the third Synoptic Gospel, comprehends in germ what was later preached and written by the apostles concerning them. True, before the Resurrection the disciples had not yet a correct conception of His Being and work; the Gospels constantly declare this. For this reason did Jesus in His teaching take into account the capacity of His children, gradually leading them to a knowledge of His Sonship and Messiahship, and left much to the teaching of the Spirit. But the Resurrection caused a wonderful light to arise upon their souls. And when the exalted Christ had fulfilled His promise of the Spirit at Pentecost they not only temporarily received extraordinary gifts of tongues and of miracle working, but they received through that Spirit, who was indeed the Spirit of Christ, a powerful strengthening of faith, a comfort and joy, such as they had never before known—a fellowship of love which bound them together as brethren and gave them an extraordinary liberty to preach the Word.

And the substance of this Word was Christ. It concerned the Son of God, Jesus of Nazareth, who was anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power, who was manifested to the Jews by power and miracles, who went about doing good, healing all who were possessed of the devil. And this holy and just One did the Jews despise and kill. But this was according

to the purpose of God, so that God might exalt Him to be Lord and Christ, a Prince and Saviour who will come again to judge the quick and the dead, that repentance and forgiveness of sins may be preached in His name because there is no other salvation.

This was the teaching according to the testimony of Luke in the *Acts* and, after Pentecost, was heard particularly from the lips of Peter, to which all the apostles practically agree. It is true, an effort has often been made to point out a great difference, and a sharp contradiction, between the Synoptic Christ and the Christ of Paul and of John, between the Gospel of the Kingdom of God which Jesus Himself proclaimed and the Gospel which the Apostle preached concerning Christ. And some have at times gone so far as to call Paul the founder of (ecclesiastical) Christianity, the falsifier of the original Gospel, yes, even the anti-christ. But in these latter years there has most clearly come to light the impossibility of finding according to the Christ of Scriptures a Jesus who did not claim to be the Messiah, who performed no miracles and who did not rise from the dead.

The historical Jesus and the apostolic Christ cannot be separated—they are one and the self-same Person. That the historical Person, Jesus, was the Messiah promised of God in the Old Testament to His people is the kernel of the Christian confession, that distinguishes it from Judaism and heathenism. For this reason there is a difference in the portraiture of Jesus by the various apostles. There is a variation in language and style, in presentation and expression; there is also development and broadening. The pre-existence of Jesus, His cosmic significance, His divinity, also the substance and fruit of His work and

the mystical union between Him and the church appear much more clearly in the epistles of Paul and the writings of John than in the first three Gospels. But of contradiction there is no thought. The Synoptic Gospels are just as valid witnesses to the faith as are all the other books of the New Testament. Mark, whose Gospel is often spoken of as being the oldest, begins with the significant words: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." All three were written in a time when Paul had for a long period preached his Gospel in wide circles, and upon which he had founded many congregations, and nothing in this early period is noticed of a controversy concerning the Person of Christ and His work. In this Paul agreed fully with all the apostles; all apostolic congregations were one in the confession of faith that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour of the World, the Lord of the church, the Judge of the quick and the dead. They all had *one* Lord, *one* faith, *one* baptism, *one* God and Father of us all, above all and in them all, and *one* Spirit through whom they were all built upon one foundation, through apostles and prophets, into the building of God.

With this preaching of Jesus as the Christ, the New Testament still confronts us. All writings contained in it are faith-witnesses and as such expect to be listened to and understood. Together they form the apostolic Gospel teaching as they are perpetuated and made for the general good of mankind in the Scriptures, just as they are repeated to the people every Sabbath from the pulpits and are spread among the heathen through the missionaries. It is of fundamental concern to look upon the writings of the New Testament in this manner as apostolic witnesses to

grace and truth as they are in Jesus. Neither the Old nor the New Testament comes to us as a book on history to teach us concerning lives of persons or nations, nor as the result of scientific labor wherein great thinkers have given us their systems; nor even as a product of culture or a phase of literature which was to increase the treasures of "fine arts and belle lettres." The Holy Scriptures are not to be placed in the same category, not even to be compared with the historical, philosophical, or literary works of the Greek-Roman world. They occupy their own peculiar place and bear an independent character. They are Gospel-preaching, faith-witnessing, expressed in the common daily language of that day, and designed for the church and its members. This is recognized more in our day than formerly, since treasures of inscriptions and papyri have enabled us to compare language and style, narration and letter form of the New Testament with those writings of old.

This is the particular method whereby all can receive and accept the witness of the apostles which comes to us through the Scriptures of the New Testament. In that sense it does not commend itself to our intellect, so as to submit itself to its criticism and to make its truth depend upon our research. It does not address itself to the wise and prudent or to the scribes and scholars of the age, because it knows beforehand that its existence does not depend upon their judgment; it is to the Greeks foolishness, to the Jews a stumbling block and not according to the wish or desire of the natural man (Matt. 11:25; 16:17; 1 Cor. 1:23; Gal. 1:11). But the Gospel of Christ addresses itself in the first instance to the heart and conscience, to man as a sinner who needs redemption and who everywhere

and always remains the same, even at the highest point of culture, with the same needs and the same aspirations. There is, therefore, no other way in which to receive the Gospel than by regeneration, faith, and conversion, the same way that the prophets and apostles and the entire church of the Old and New Testaments have trodden, that was pointed out to Nicodemus by Christ Himself: "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3; compare 7:17; 1 Cor. 12:3).

But he who thus hears and accepts the Gospel receives it not as the word of man, but, as it truly is, the Word of God, and he beholds in the Word which became flesh a glory as of the Only Begotten of the Father. Both go indissolubly together. Whoever believes in Christ also accepts His witness through the mouths of the apostles; and he who is not only a hearer but also a doer of the Word presses forward through the apostolic witness to the Christ Himself. And a new light arises upon all things for such; Christ, God, the world, man, nature, history, culture, all things in Heaven and on earth, receive, as to their origin, being, and object, another meaning and value; and Christianity, with Christ as center, becomes to him a new, beautiful, glorified world, and life-view, because the Mediator between God and man assures him of the extension and completion of the eternal Kingdom of God.

THE DAY OF PENTECOST

By REV. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D. D., Wycliffe College,
Toronto, Canada

TO MOST visitors to Jerusalem the Church of the Holy Sepulcher is the special place of attraction, but there is another spot of great interest known as the Upper Room. It is not the room, but the site, which is so attractive, because while the room is only medieval, the place has had a Christian edifice there, of one sort or another, from very early days. It is said that a building used as a church was there as early as the time of Hadrian, A.D. 115. Indeed, one of our greatest scholars expressed to the present writer the opinion that it is the only place in Jerusalem about the location of which we can be perfectly certain.

Whether this be so or not, the Upper Room recorded in the Book of Acts is of particular interest, because it was the place where Christianity in its full and complete form had its beginning. In harmony with this, we observe the great prominence given to the Day of Pentecost in the Acts of the Apostles. That occasion may be rightly regarded as a watershed between two dispensations, looking back on all that had passed, and looking forward to all that was to come. And yet, speaking with strictness, Pentecost was not the actual beginning of Christianity, for it undoubtedly commenced on that day when the two disciples heard John, their old master, testify to "the Lamb of God" which led to their leaving him and following the Lord Jesus (John 1:37). But for all practical purposes, and especially in connection with the coming of the Holy Spirit to abide with the people

of God, the Day of Pentecost may conveniently be called the birthday of the Christian church.

THE TIME

1. Pentecost was a Jewish feast, and this suggests that Christianity is the culmination of the earlier Jewish revelation. All that had preceded it was preparatory. It is customary to speak of three dispensations—of the Father, of the Son, and of the Spirit. The dispensation of the Father is regarded as extending from the Creation to the coming of Christ. The dispensation of the Son covers the earthly life and ministry of our Lord. The dispensation of the Spirit commences with the Day of Pentecost and includes the entire time until our Lord's return.

The Jewish features of the Day of Pentecost, as recorded in Acts, are very noteworthy, suggesting that Pentecost itself was really transitional. It represented an offer to the Jews as well as the beginning of the new order of things. This Jewish element calls for special study. Thus the disciples asked our Lord whether it was His intention to restore the kingdom to *Israel* (Acts 1:6). Then, too, the sermon of Peter was based upon a prophecy in Joel which, when taken literally, is full of Jewish teaching, and it is difficult, if not impossible, to spiritualize it in such a way as to remove these Jewish features. Whatever secondary applications there may be, it is impossible to doubt that the primary interpretation of the prophecy was made to the Jews when Peter spoke. The same Jewish characteristics of Pentecost may be seen from a comparison of the history of the church during the time covered by the Acts, and the period associated with St. Paul's epistles written after the date of Acts 28.

Thus in the former Jews are mentioned twenty-five times; in the latter only once. In the former, Israel is found fourteen times; in the latter only twice. In the former, Abraham is mentioned nineteen times; in the latter not at all. In the former, spiritual gifts are evident throughout, especially the gift of healing, and yet in the latter we read of Epaphroditus, Timothy, and Trophimus in circumstances which do not admit of the idea of physical healing by spiritual gifts. Again, the Jewish features of Acts, commencing with Pentecost, can be seen by a comparison of the earlier and later epistles of St. Paul—those written during the period covered by Acts and those written later. In the earlier epistles the Jews are mentioned twenty-five times and in the later only once. In the earlier tongues are found twenty-two times, but in the later not once. In the earlier epistles spiritual gifts are recorded nine times, but only twice in the later, while, in the earlier, prophecy is found thirteen times, and not once in the later.

All this is particularly remarkable when it is remembered that Luke, the author of Acts, was a companion of the Apostle Paul and must have known and entered into the Apostle's specific spiritual teaching. The fact that notwithstanding this he recorded so essentially Jewish a story as is found here seems to indicate that no interpretation of Pentecost can possibly be correct which does not keep in view the definite Jewish features.

2. Pentecost was also the Feast of Harvest. In this respect we may regard it as symbolical of the new religion, which was intended to be one of spiritual life and fruit. As the natural harvest can be said originally to come from God, notwithstanding all the

secondary elements and features associated with it, so Christianity was originally and primarily a revelation of God intended to produce life and express fruit in human affairs. The Apostle frequently uses this symbol to indicate what Christianity was intended to be—"being filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ" (Phil. 1:11).

3. It is an old Jewish tradition that the Law was received by Moses on Mt. Sinai on the Day of Pentecost, and if we may regard this as true, it is certainly suggestive and helpful in connection with Christianity considered as the new law for human life. While the Apostle Paul is always insistent upon the utter impossibility of man's obtaining his salvation by an observance of law, yet nevertheless he is ready with his bold paradoxes to speak of "the law of faith" (Rom. 3:27), and "the law of the Spirit of life" (Rom. 8:2). Not only so, he maintains that faith does not make void law but, on the contrary, establishes it (Rom. 3:31). So while we are careful to avoid any thought of legalism, we may rightly speak of Christianity as "a new law," for what the old law could not do the Holy Spirit enables the believer to do through faith in Christ, and thus the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in those who walk after the Spirit (Rom. 8:4).

THE CHARACTER

It is important to endeavor to understand the meaning of this Day of Pentecost, for it has several bearings, each of which calls for notice.

1. It was the vindication of Jesus Christ to the Jews. According to the record, He had been received up into Heaven, and thereby was glorified by the

Father. This, as it has been well said, was a new fact—a perfect man in Heaven. Up to that time there had been only “the spirits of just men.” Then, our Lord having received the gift of the Holy Spirit and having poured this out upon His followers, the Apostle was able to show the difference between the Jewish view of Christ and that of the Father, thereby demonstrating the character and the claim of Jesus Christ. In the light of the Crucifixion and the charges against Jesus Christ on the part of the Jews, this Day of Pentecost was a significant justification of what Jesus of Nazareth had claimed to be and to do. And this vindication at the same time showed the true meaning and divine acceptance of His death and the divine acknowledgment of His lordship over men (Acts 2:32-36).

2. It was a revelation of truth. We read in the Fourth Gospel that certain things were not understood by the disciples because their Master at that time had not been glorified and, as a consequence, the Holy Spirit had not been bestowed. But Pentecost involved an operation of the Holy Spirit such as had never existed before (John 7:39). In the light of it many dark places were illuminated and much that the disciples could not understand during Christ’s earthly life then, and thenceforward, became clear (John 2:22; 12:16; 14:26).

3. It was a manifestation of power. Pentecost was not the regeneration of the disciples, for they were already followers of their Master, but it certainly involved a new era and influx of grace. It was something distinct from conversion and intended for service. In the Old Testament and in the Gospels we have the record of the Holy Spirit as already at work, but this, on the Day of Pentecost, was a fuller manifesta-

tion of His power, and its newness lay in the relation of the Holy Spirit to Christ. To the disciples the gift at Pentecost may be said to be analogous to the descent of the Holy Spirit on our Lord at His baptism; it was the initiation into and consecration to specific service for God. On that day came the bestowal of power, as in their Master's case, adequate to the new demands that were so soon to be made upon them.

The various elements of this new life of power were as follows: (a) The power of speech for propagating the new message (Acts 2:4). The same is seen in the sermon preached by the Apostle Peter. (b) Courage was also evident as they faced those who had crucified their Master (Acts 2:14). (c) Truth was manifest in its convincing power (Acts 2:37). (d) The influence of the new life made an impression on those around (Acts 2:43). (e) Not least of all, the holiness of the new disciples was seen as they witnessed to the reality and grace of their Master (Acts 2:47). It is particularly striking that, in the Fourth Gospel, there are no less than seven witnesses associated with testimony to Christ, and of these the Holy Spirit and the disciples were the last and, in some respects, the most important (John 5:32-39; 15:26, 27). A witness should possess three qualifications: Knowledge, candor, and disinterestedness. In these respects the disciples, on the Day of Pentecost, were capable and thorough witnesses for their Master.

4. It was an expression of love. When the new body was constituted by the gift of the Spirit the result was soon seen in fellowship and unselfishness (Acts 2:42, 44, 45). Nothing could be more striking than the proof of the new life as these Christians united

with each other in fellowship by means of the Holy Spirit. Of them it could be said with absolute literalness: "See how these Christians love one another."

5. It was a time of joy. This was a new experience, and one that became pre-eminent characteristic of the early Christian church. Nothing in its way is more striking than the presence of joy in these records, and, indeed, joy is one of the features of pure, full Christianity wherever it is experienced. There was the joy of reconciliation (2:41) and the joy of consecration (2:46). Students of church history will recall the fact and force of joy during the ages in proportion as Christianity has been heartily received and welcomed. The centuries known as the Dark Ages are marked by the virtual absence of joy, and this element of joy has burst forth again and again in spiritual revivals.

Thus we may say that the character of the Day of Pentecost included a new position for their Master, new light for the disciples, new life, a new body, and new experience. This was, and still is, essential Christianity.

THE OUTCOME

The story of Pentecost lays great stress on the word "all." They were "all together in one place" (Acts 2:1). The sound filled "all the house" (v. 2). They were "all filled with the Holy Spirit" (v. 4). The multitude were "all amazed" (v. 7). The Apostle referred to the prophecy about pouring out the divine "Spirit upon all flesh" (v. 17). He also spoke of himself and the other followers of Christ by saying: "We all are witnesses" (v. 32). And then the new community is described as "all that believed" (v. 44).

1. The first result was the Holy Spirit *on* the disciples (vs. 1-3). The symbols are of special importance and significance. The sound as of a wind was a symbol of life, reminding them of Ezekiel's valley of dry bones. The sight as of fire would be a symbol of power, energizing them for their work. The touch as of tongues would be a symbol of utterance, teaching them and equipping them for what had to be said.

2. Then came the Spirit *in* them (v. 4). They were filled with the reality which had been symbolized. Their souls became full of the presence of Christ, their hearts full of the love of Christ, and their life full of the truth of Christ. Both sexes of the one hundred and twenty disciples had this new experience, enabling them to understand, to feel, and then to express, what had come to them from their Master.

3. Then came the Holy Spirit *through* them (vs. 5-11). This was the manifestation of what had been symbolized and experienced. They began to speak, and their testimony was at once supernatural, impressive, divine. They bore testimony to Christ and declared "the mighty works of God."

It is very important to remember that the Holy Spirit came only upon believers, and through believers alone was manifested. This was in exact agreement with their Master's words: "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you. And he, when he is come, will convict the world" (John 16:7, 8), i. e., *through you*.

Thus the proper interpretation of that passage shows that the conviction of the world was to come, in some way, through the church, and this is exactly what happened on the Day of Pentecost, for we notice that

the preaching of the Apostle produced this very conviction of sin (Acts 2:37). But it is sometimes forgotten that he proclaimed the very three truths mentioned by our Lord (John 16:8-10). He declared to the house of Israel their sin in not believing on Jesus Christ. He proclaimed the righteousness of Christ by reason of God's reception of Him into Heaven. He announced in effect a very definite judgment as he proclaimed the great realities of his message. This always takes place as a direct result of proclaiming Christian truth. The preacher or teacher, either individually or representing the church, is used of God to convince men through the proclamation of divine truth. No conversion to God ever takes place apart from some human agency, direct or indirect, personal or written. No one has ever been led to Christ in the center of Africa or elsewhere apart from some testimony to Christ by life or word. Our Master said distinctly of the Holy Spirit: "Whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him" (John 14:17).

THE SECRET

Pentecost was a specimen or type of all true Christian life and service. The miraculous gift and accompaniments were temporary, but the spiritual graces are perennial and permanent. It therefore remains to inquire how all this spiritual experience may be ours. Objectively, the Lord Jesus Christ is still the risen, ascended, and exalted Lord; subjectively, the Holy Spirit is still the power in the hearts and lives of believers. But while the Day of Pentecost is never repeated historically, it may be, and should be, experienced again and again spiritually, if only we fulfil

the necessary conditions. The one requirement which seems to apply to everything is found in the words "with one accord" (Acts 2:1).

1. They were all united in prayer (Acts 1:14) as they waited for the coming of this gift.

2. They were all united in expectation before this gift came (Acts 2:1).

3. They were all united in life after this gift had come, as they realized what had happened and rejoiced in the new-found treasures of Christ placed at their disposal (Acts 2:46).

4. They were all united in purpose (Acts 4:24). The one thought that ruled every heart was the glory of God and the desire that God should be manifested and Christ exalted even in the face of enemies (Acts 4:29-31).

Thus, as they waited with singleness of aim, readiness of spirit, and willingness of life, the Spirit came upon and blessed them. The New Testament picture is that of a Spirit-filled church, a community of Christians "full" of the Spirit of God, and herein consists the essential difference between life before and life after Pentecost. Whatever had been the state of affairs previous to that time, it was nothing compared with the life of the church then and afterward.

But the trouble is that so many Christians to-day possess an experience which is only on a level with the earlier dispensations of the Old Testament and of the Gospels. Although the dispensations of the Father and of the Son are historically past, they are still experimentally present in many lives. But the dispensation of the Holy Spirit ushered in at Pentecost was marked beyond all else in a threefold way. It was characterized by (a) a rich personal experience: Men were full of

faith (Acts 6:5), wisdom (Acts 6:3), joy (Acts 13:52), and hope (Acts 7:55). Then it was noteworthy for its (b) great personal courage, both of speech (Acts 4:31) and of action (Acts 9:31). And as the outcome there was (c) splendid personal service in preaching (Acts 2:4) and living (Acts 9:31). There is scarcely anything more outstanding or more striking in the story of the primitive church recorded in the Acts than the association of the Holy Spirit with every part of the life of the disciple and the community. Not only are men like Peter, Stephen, and Paul filled with the Holy Spirit (Acts 4:8; 7:55; 9:17), but ordinary disciples have exactly the same experience (Acts 4:31; 13:52), and almost every Christian grace is associated with the Holy Spirit, including wisdom (Acts 6:3), comfort (Acts 9:31), power (Acts 10:38), faith (Acts 11:24), and joy (Acts 13:52). This is God's purpose for all and at all times, and it is a disastrous error to regard it as a luxury for the few, or for spiritual occasions alone.

The only difference between us to-day and those disciples on the Day of Pentecost is that while they waited for the Spirit, there is no need for us to wait, but only to accept Him, to yield to Him, and to allow Him to enter and take full possession of every part of our being. They waited *for* the Spirit, but we wait *on* the Spirit. In their case it was necessary to receive the Spirit for the first time, but with us it is not so much a question of our having more of the Spirit as of the Spirit having more of us. The Holy Spirit has been given and is here, never to depart from the church, and the normal Christian life described as "full of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 6:3) ought to be true of us all. And it will be, on the one

condition of trustful surrender to Christ. The Lord Jesus Christ must be glorified in our lives, must reign on the throne of our wills, as Lord and King (Rom. 14:9), if we are to receive the Holy Spirit and be the means of blessing to others (John 7:39). And thus we shall know, possess, and enjoy the Spirit of God as the Spirit of life, of light, of liberty, of love; the Spirit of loyalty to God, of likeness to Christ, and of labor for our fellow-man at home and abroad.

THE REVISED VERSION AND THE GREEK TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

By PROFESSOR MATTHEW B. RIDDLE, D. D., of the Western Theological
Seminary, Allegheny, Pennsylvania

THE revised New Testament represents a better Greek text than the Authorized Version. Better, because, by all the laws of historical evidence and of human probability, it is more accurate, corresponding more closely with what was written by the inspired authors. "Textual criticism" is the phrase applied to the discussion of the various readings which occur. Such a discussion inevitably resulted from the existence of various readings—"readings" being used in the technical sense of the forms of the Greek text.

The Authorized Version, published in 1611, was made when there was little knowledge of textual criticism. The Greek Testament on which it was principally based was that of Beza, which differed very slightly from that of Stephen (1550). This edition is generally regarded in England as containing the "Received Text," but on the Continent that phrase is taken from an Elzevir edition, published in 1633, and claiming to be "received by all." Indeed that text held its ground for two centuries. But the "Received Text" was uncritical. Its history, in every detail, is well known, and it is safe to say that it does not deserve the place it so long held.

But textual criticism began to claim its rights. The principles which should govern it were formulated by a German scholar named Griesbach, and all editors and commentators recognized its importance. The

discovery of a very ancient manuscript at Mt. Sinai, in 1859, awakened great interest in regard to the Greek text of the New Testament; the age and value of this manuscript will be referred to later. A number of editions of the Greek text appeared, notably one by an English scholar named Tregelles and another by the German, Tischendorf.

But the revisers did not adopt any edition as authoritative. There is a prevalent belief that the edition of Westcott and Hort was the basis of the Revised Version, but this is not correct. That edition did not appear until after considerable progress had been made in the work of revision. The first copy was placed in my hands for collation, and hence could not have been the basis of the Revised Version. It is true that both of these editors were members of the English company, and doubtless had great influence as individuals, but the Americans never accepted their theories as a whole.

Both companies, English and American, made their own text; that is, wherever there was a variation in reading that would affect the English rendering they discussed that reading and decided for or against it. The Americans decided by a majority vote, but the English company required two-thirds to accept a reading different from that on which the Authorized Version was based.

It will be seen that this involved great labor. As a rule we Americans each had with us when we met a copy of Tischendorf's eighth critical edition of the Greek Testament. This was not because we intended to accept his readings, but because in that edition the "authorities," manuscripts, versions, and Fathers, were cited. Moreover, all the readings on which the

Authorized Version was based were given, with the evidence for each. Thus all the historical facts were before us. It is probable that at one time or another we compared as many as ten thousand readings. The "ancient authorities," so often referred to in the margin of the Revised Version, were weighed, not counted, and all were duly estimated. But this estimate was not a mechanical one. Internal evidence was recognized. The briefer readings and the more difficult readings were given the preference. But there was no cast-iron rule; each reading must be determined by itself.

Here I must say that in all these discussions there was the utmost candor. It would have been impossible to determine the readings from doctrinal bias or to make the Revised Version the representative of some theological tendency, though this has been alleged by those opposed to its acceptance.

It should be noticed that with most of the important changes of text the revisers give a marginal reading, usually that of the so-called Received Text. These margins deserve attention, for they often suggest the reasons for the preferred reading. The usual form of these margins is: "Some ancient authorities read." This implies that the evidence for the reading is not very strong. But other forms indicate stronger evidence, such as: "Many ancient authorities read" or "Many very ancient authorities read." Occasionally a few added words point to some peculiarity in the evidence and justify the decision of the revisers.

But what are the "ancient authorities" referred to? They are usually grouped as (1) Greek manuscripts, (2) ancient versions, (3) early Christian Fathers. The manuscripts, however, are in two forms: Those

written in large square letters, which are termed *uncial*, and those written in running hand, which are called *cursive*. The former are older, dating from the fourth to the ninth century. These are naturally considered of most weight. About eighty were known when the Revised Version was made, but many of these were fragmentary, and few were older than the sixth century. The cursives are much more numerous, but far less valuable. Perhaps twenty or thirty (out of the thousand known to exist) have some weight as confirming a reading found in the uncials, but as independent witnesses scarcely any deserve attention.

All these codices have Latin names, and also "designations" to promote brevity in citing them. For the uncials capital letters are used for designations, first Roman capitals, then Greek (when different in form from the Roman), and also a Hebrew letter, *aleph*. The cursives are designated by Arabic numerals; but as these codices are classified into four parts, and numbered accordingly, much confusion results. There are less than half a dozen that have the same number throughout the New Testament, comparatively few containing all the parts. The uncials have the same designation throughout the parts they contain. While about eighty were known when the Revised Version was made, many of these were of comparatively late date; some were merely fragments, and the larger number contained only a portion of the New Testament. Practically, the five oldest codices were the most complete, and few readings not found in one or more of these were accepted by the revisers. Probably a score of others gave corroborative evidence. In view of this it is proper to give some account of these oldest codices.

Codex Sinaiticus, so named because it was discovered in the monastery of St. Catherine at Mt. Sinai. The story of its discovery by Tischendorf, in 1859, is an exceedingly interesting one. The designation *Aleph* was given it because the Roman and Greek capitals were all in use and this designation gave it deserved prominence. It is the most complete manuscript known, and one of the two oldest (fourth century). Its discovery had a great effect upon textual criticism, for its evidence practically decided the reading in many passages previously in doubt, while it led to a demand for a thorough revision of the Greek text. It is now at Petrograd. It originally included the Septuagint, large portions of which still remain. Naturally Tischendorf follows its readings oftener than other critical editors.

Codex Alexandrinus. This manuscript of the fifth century was presented in 1628 to King Charles I of England by the Patriarch of Constantinople, formerly of Alexandria, hence its name, and probably its designation, A; now in the British Museum. It originally contained the entire Septuagint and the New Testament. But it is now defective, nearly all of the Gospel of Matthew being lost, and some other portions. In the Gospels its text resembles that of the later cursives, but in the Epistles it agrees very closely with the older codices. It was the first uncial manuscript used by Biblical scholars.

Codex Vaticanus, in the Vatican library at Rome. Its designation is B. Probably of the same age as *Aleph*, though possibly a little older. It contains the Septuagint (with gaps), but is defective in the New Testament from Hebrews 9:14, lacking the Pastoral Epistles. On the whole it is the most valuable of

known manuscripts, though its readings should be judged with proper regard to other sources of evidence. To disregard its evidence because it is at Rome is an unwarranted prejudice.

Codex Ephraemi Syri, the name being due to the fact that the works of Ephraem the Syrian were written over the original Bible text. Its designation is C, and it once covered the entire Bible. It is in the National Library at Paris. It dates from the fifth century. But it is very defective, about two-fifths of the New Testament being lost. Often it is scarcely legible because of the Syriac written over the Biblical text. But its readings are quite valuable, ranking next to those of B and *Aleph*.

Codex Bezae, presented by Theodore Beza to the University at Cambridge, England. It contains the Gospels and the Acts, and is designated D. Though its date is the sixth century, and though not as valuable as the four older codices, it has peculiarities that give weight to its evidence. The scribe evidently was not familiar with Greek and has given a parallel Latin version. The text contains many additions, so that the codex is a strong witness for a briefer reading. Its very errors sometimes shed light on the history of variations.

The ancient versions are of great value, especially the older Latin, for several manuscripts contain a Latin text, older than the Vulgate of Jerome. The Coptic is also very ancient.

The citations by the early Fathers are not always accurate, but occasionally are of considerable weight. The changes of Greek text accepted by the revisers are very numerous, over five thousand in all. The Gospels present most instances owing to the influence

of parallel passages. The Gospel of Mark, the briefest of the four, has been most extensively altered in text.

As a rule the emendations throughout the New Testament are based on briefer readings than those of the Received Text. The additions are comparatively few, only ten in all, while the substitutions are very frequent, appearing in at least half the verses. The omissions naturally attract the most attention, and have raised most doubt among ordinary readers. Hence, as it is impossible to discuss all the variations, and indeed most of them will scarcely be noticed by the careless reader, it seems best to take up the principal omissions. When the reasons for such omissions are given, the principles which governed the revisers will be apparent. The Revised Version usually has a marginal note joined to such omissions, and these notes often give a hint of the reason for the change. Attention may be called to some of the more remarkable substitutions.

The Doxology appended to the Lord's Prayer in Matthew 6:13 is not found in the oldest Greek manuscripts nor in the early Latin versions. If it were genuine there would be no motive for omitting it. The marginal note points to variations in the early authorities that insert it, which is against its genuineness. Early Fathers, who comment on the Gospel of Matthew, ignore it. It is probably a liturgical addition.

The conclusion of the Gospel of Mark (16:9-20). These verses are not omitted in the Revised Version, but are separated from what precedes by a blank line. This is practically equivalent to omitting the passage in the margin. The case is a peculiar one. As stated in the margin, "the two oldest Greek manuscripts, and

some other authorities, omit from verse 9 to the end. Some other authorities have a different ending to the Gospel." The internal peculiarities are remarkable. Verse 8 closes abruptly, and verse 9 has no direct connection with it. The diction is not that of Mark, and the passage adds next to nothing to the history. Yet the immense mass of authorities contain it. The strongest evidence in favor of its genuineness is that of Irenaeus (about 200 A.D.), who cites verse 19 as part of the Gospel of Mark; but most scholars hold that the passage is authentic, that is, true, but not genuine—not written by Mark himself. Various theories are held to explain the apparently unfinished character of verse 8. At all events the testimony of Irenaeus is very weighty in favor of the genuineness of the passage.

Considerable adverse comment has been made on the omission of John 5:3 (in part) and 4; but by all the principles of textual criticism the revisers are justified in omitting the passage. It is true there is a variation in the authorities, but the weightiest evidence is clearly in favor of omitting verse 4 altogether, and the last clause of verse 3 is found in only one of the earlier manuscripts. It seems probable that "waiting for the moving of the water" (verse 3) was first interpolated to explain verse 7, "when the water is troubled," and that verse 4 was a current explanation which was afterward added. The manuscript D, which contains many enlargements, omits verse 4, and, in view of its character, this is very important evidence. But to this must be added the testimony of several earlier manuscripts (*Aleph*, B, C.) together with minor authorities. Both English and American revisers agreed in favor of the omission.

The story of the woman taken in adultery (John 7:53-8:11) is probably true, but it is very unlikely to have been a part of this Gospel. The revisers have not only set the passage by itself, dropping a line before and after it, but have enclosed it in brackets, adding this statement in the margin: "Most of the ancient authorities omit John 7:53-8:11. Those which contain it vary much from each other." It is not found in *Aleph* and B. (A and C are defective here.) In ten cursives it is placed at the end of the Gospel of John and in four at the end of Luke 21. It was unknown to the Greek and early Latin Fathers, though widely current in Latin Gospels of the fourth century. The many variations in the text oppose its genuineness. Moreover, it interrupts the context, and departs from the style of John. But, as the teachings of the passage are not in accord with the ascetic tendencies of the age when it first appears, the story must be regarded as true, though there is some discussion as to whence it was derived.

The baptismal confession of the eunuch (Acts 8:37) is omitted by the revisers. The best Greek manuscripts do not contain it. Moreover, there is no motive for omitting it, were it genuine, while there would be ecclesiastical reasons for adding it. Yet even the Vulgate did not originally contain it, though it afterward accepted it. Then the variation in the authorities that have the longer reading is one argument against accepting it. There is a general agreement among textual critics that it is a later interpolation.

The Heavenly witnesses (1 John 5:7, 8). This much discussed passage is ignored in the Revised Version. It is not only omitted from the text, but

there is no marginal reference to it. The passage is wanting in all the Greek manuscripts written before the fifteenth century, in all the ancient versions, and in all the Greek Fathers who, in the Nicene age, quoted every available proof text for the Trinitarian doctrine and could not have overlooked this had they known it or found it in any manuscript. It first appeared in Latin copies, and from them passed into two very late Greek manuscripts of no authority. The internal evidence is decidedly against the passage, for John would not have written: "the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit," but either "the Father, the Son," or "God, the Word." Moreover, there is no real correspondence between the two sets of terms "in heaven" and "on earth." The doctrine of the Holy Trinity is not affected by the omission, for as Dr. Woolsey quietly remarked when this passage was discussed by the revisers: "That doctrine was held for a thousand years before this passage appeared in any Greek manuscript, and will hold its own a thousand years after it disappears from the Greek Testament." The views here presented are held by nearly all modern textual critics.

Attention may now be called to some of the substitutions which for one reason or another deserve comment.

The first is that in the *Gloria in Excelsis*, where the addition of a single letter changes the structure and sense of the angels' chant. In the Revised Version, accepting this addition, this chant is rendered: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom he is well pleased." The literal rendering is: "Men of good pleasure," which is thus explained. But the omission of the letter spoken of

leads to the rendering: "Good pleasure among men." The variation is an old one, but the oldest Greek manuscripts attest the reading "of good pleasure," which is upheld by good versions and many Fathers. In its favor is the structure, which thus becomes a couplet instead of a triplet. Many critics, however, do not accept the form "men of good pleasure" though a few defend the rendering of the Authorized Version.

There is a remarkable variation in the text of John 1:18. Instead of "the only begotten Son" many very ancient authorities read "God only begotten," a phrase found nowhere else in the New Testament. As this was the reading of the two oldest Greek manuscripts, the English company at first accepted it, but the American company preferred the other and succeeded in retaining it. The Greek words "Son" and "God" when abbreviated are readily interchanged. Moreover, there is no trace of this peculiar reading in the discussions of the Nicene Council, which antedated our oldest manuscripts. The American reading is more natural and free from objection.

As a rule the English and American companies agreed in regard to the Greek text, but they occasionally differed. In Acts 20:28 the English company retain the reading of the received text, "church of God," while the American company prefer "church of the Lord." The former reading undoubtedly has the older manuscript authority, but the latter is well attested by early versions. The Fathers are divided, also modern editors. The added phrase "which he purchased with his own blood" seems to imply directly the deity of Christ, but it also suggests the peculiar combination, blood of God, which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. This led the Americans to

accept "of the Lord," though the present writer has some doubt as to the correctness of the judgment of his colleagues.

Another passage where the two companies differ is Romans 5:1. Here the two readings are: "Let us have" and "we have." The variation is simply in a single letter. "Let us have" is undoubtedly better supported by early authorities, but the American company adopted "we have" on internal grounds. The change of a short "O" into a long one might easily be made, and the positive "we have" might arouse doubt in weak Christians. Yet "let us have" does not favor unevangelical doctrine, since it bids us take the place that God provides. But the exhortation seems less appropriate than the declaration.

In 1 Timothy 3:16, where the Received Text reads "God," the revisers have substituted "He who," or in the Greek simply "who" referring to the "mystery of godliness," that is, Christ. This change has been greatly criticised, since the passage has been so long used as a proof text for the deity of Christ, but the weight of external and internal evidence is decidedly in favor of the reading "who," which is adopted by all recent critical editors. (1) The best Greek manuscripts so read—*Aleph*, A, C (B is defective here)—though some of them were corrected much later. In the Greek the two readings resemble each other, and the correction was readily made. In the case of A it has been proven by microscopic and chemical investigation that the change to "God" was made in comparatively recent times. In *Aleph* the correction was made in the twelfth century. (2) All the weighty ancient versions have a relative pronoun here. (3) The oldest Fathers sustain the relative pronoun, the other reading seems

not to have been known before the latter part of the fourth century. (4) But the reading "God" is objectionable on internal grounds. Of the six predicates which follow only one can be properly applied to God, whereas all six can appropriately be applied to "the mystery of godliness." Indeed it is now generally held that the passage is a citation from a primitive creed or hymn in praise of Christ, since the structure is obviously poetic. That the change in the Revised Version detracts from the deity of Christ is not true, for it is implied throughout by its presentation of the Incarnation.

These examples will, it is hoped, show how thorough was the work of the revisers in dealing with the Greek text. All evidence was considered, and that in thousands of cases, and by men whose candor and lack of prejudice must be admitted by all who knew them well.

EDGEWORTH, PENNSYLVANIA.

PAULINISM

By PROFESSOR FREDERICK LINCOLN ANDERSON, D. D., of Newton
Theological Institution

THE Teaching of Paul sprang from the depths of his personality and from his spiritual and apostolic experiences of God's dealings with him. He was no abstract philosopher with an ideal and theoretic construction, but a practical man with facts, and his whole philosophic effort was to proclaim and defend these facts and experiences and to fit them into the scheme of life and religion as he apprehended it.

The sources of our information are his occasional letters, all written to meet concrete historical situations, stating his views to edify the churches, or to oppose or correct the views of others. Only Romans and Ephesians approach any systematic completeness, and Romans is written from the viewpoint of the Judaistic controversy. We have no complete and rounded statement of Paulinism. All is shot through, moreover, with the intense feeling of the man, and his desire to reach practical ends. Indeed Paul is not a systematic theologian, but a living creator and remolder of religious and theological ideas in his efforts to establish the church in the Roman Empire. This is the secret of his continuous power in the world.

Paul was a Jew and always remained a Jew, in spite of a very thorough knowledge of the Greek language and Greek life. He was immersed in Old Testament conceptions and phraseology. He was the brightest scholar of the rabbis of his time. He entered with enthusiasm into rabbinic thought and went in

earnest into the effort to keep the law, for some years with great self-satisfaction and pride. Here he acquired that rabbinic fashion of exegesis and reasoning, which he never wholly shook off.

But his self-satisfaction ended one day when he considered the tenth commandment, "Thou shalt not covet" (Rom. 7:7-9), and saw that the law demanded more than external Pharisaic obedience. That day all his joy in life vanished, and a dark struggle with his inner sinfulness began, an experience of defeat and shame. In this hopeless struggle he learned the impossibility and powerlessness of the law as a means of salvation, and the dreadful power of sin which ruled as a master in him (Rom. 7:7-24).

While in this state, he was converted by his vision of the risen Christ on the way to Damascus. This was the greatest experience of his life. He was newly created. From this crisis he dates everything, and to it he refers everything. He always thinks of Christ as he saw Him that day.

This experience was the fountain whence flowed his fundamental teachings as a Christian apostle. It involved the following convictions:

1. Jesus is risen.

2. He is therefore the Messiah, as He claimed.

3. And consequently Lord. The divine glory of His appearance confirmed this and immediately raised Jesus above the human sphere.

4. Paul then was "the chief of sinners," caught in the act of fighting against God's Messiah. His very legalistic righteousness, of which he had been so proud, had led him on to this extreme of sin.

5. In this experience he learned the gracious forgiveness of sins. He had no excuse to offer. He felt

that he deserved the worst punishment. And yet to him, all undeserving, Jesus appeared with words of love, not only forgiving him out of hand, but reposing confidence in him and calling him to a high and holy service. Here Paul got his glad news of the grace of God apart from the works of the law.

6. He saw that faith was the only requisite. In this experience his only part, so far as he could discover, was faith, belief in this heavenly forgiving Saviour and complete surrender and devotion to Him. All his painfully wrought out legalistic righteousness was utterly worthless now. Faith, and faith alone, availed. Only later was he to realize how this simplified life. Yet in the first experience he would have felt the emancipation, the relief, the liberty of the sons of God from the heavy yoke of imposed obedience and the threats of wrath.

7. And he felt new life in him, a new freedom, peace, joy, and love, a new sense of purity, an access of spiritual energy which surely promised victory in the moral struggle, a grander purpose, a feeling of union with Christ and with God. This new life was so wonderful and heavenly that Paul thought it could be nothing less than the divine energy communicated to him and the power of the Spirit working in him.

8. His conversion confirmed him in his Pharisaic doctrines of predestination and election. The glorified Christ surely chose him. He did not first choose Christ. And Christ's choice of him was based, so far as he could see, on nothing good in him, but sprang out of the purest grace and love. And this he was sure was God's eternal love and purpose of grace for him.

This experience changed Paul right about face. He was still the same eager, powerful, zealous man

he had always been, but he then and there definitely abandoned a system which had brought him to inner despair and open opposition to God's Messiah, for a religion of love to Christ and joy in His salvation. Saul the Pharisee was dead. Saul the Christian lived and rejoiced. And he devoted himself to his new Saviour with even greater devotion and singleness of heart than he had ever shown in Pharisaism.

This new spiritual life given on the one spiritual condition of faith made Saul a universalist. If the Messiah would accept the chief of sinners, the head and front of His opponents, on this one condition, no Gentile could be sunk so low as to be excluded. Pharisaic narrowness was therefore unjustified, and all men might come on the same terms. So Paul says that his call to the Gentiles dated from his conversion.

After all, Paul's two main ideas are:

1. Free forgiveness by faith alone, and
2. New life in union with Christ and God.

These are the two elements of salvation as Paul sees it. We proceed now to observe how he elaborates them in the practical crises which he met.

First of all, Paul always connects these two elements. To him they are really one. Faith is the nexus. Faith not only receives the divine pardon, but is the entire surrender of the man to Christ as Saviour. As such it brings men into union with Christ, and through that into union with God. But it is not only the first, it is also the most fundamental continuous activity of the new life. We not only have our access into the new state of grace by faith (Rom. 5:2), but we live a life of faith (Gal. 2:20). As this faith is belief in Christ and surrender to Christ, Christ becomes our life (Phil. 1:21; Gal. 2:20; Col. 3:4). We live in

Him. "In Christ" is Paul's briefest phrase. "He lives in me" means practically the same thing. This is the unexpressed link which connects Romans 1-5 and 6-8. The forgiven man, who has surrendered to Christ in faith, cannot but live the new life in Christ, and this life is, of course, a life of righteousness and sanctification.

What has the law to do with it? This is the insistent question of the Jews and of Gentile and Jewish Christians, and Paul answers it out of his experience.

1. The law is divine, it is holy, just, and good. Its purpose is to give life, and it would do so if men would and could obey it (Gal. 3:21; Rom. 7:12).

2. But on account of indwelling sin, the law is unable to get itself obeyed (Rom. 8:3). It threatens and commands, but it cannot dislodge reigning sin or make a new man. This was Paul's experience. Indeed the law by its prohibitions often only exasperates the sinful heart to fresh and bolder rebellion. And as it co-operates with sin, not only exasperating men to new sin but by its light rendering their sin more guilty, and by its powerlessness driving them to despair and recklessness, it is often represented as the ally of sin, the strength of sin (1 Cor. 15:56), and we are said to die to law when we die to sin (Rom. 7:1-5).

3. Still the law does have a real part in salvation. It exposes sin, shows sin's true nature as spiritual and opposed to God, convicts men of sin, and by its powerlessness to help the convicted sinner it shuts men up to Christ and leads them to Him as Saviour. So through the law, Paul died to the law, that he might live unto God (Gal. 2:19).

4. Paul points out that, as a matter of history, the law was neither primary nor fundamental. The grace system of free forgiveness has always been in operation. Abraham and David were saved by grace. The law was never meant to save men, but to give men a norm of conduct. Only the Spirit could give them the moral and spiritual energy necessary to reach that norm.

5. Paul does abolish the law as a way to salvation. Nobody ever was or can be saved by it alone. Christ is the end of it in that aspect (Rom. 10:4). But Paul establishes the law as the ideal and norm of conduct (Rom. 3:31). The whole new way of salvation has as its end the perfect fulfilling of the law (Rom. 8:4). The very ideas of forgiveness and grace demand the law as their background. God is never dethroned as moral governor by the grace system. His reign is rather established as it never could be by the law system of salvation. Forgiven men now love to obey.

This brings us to the next point: How can God offer a free forgiveness to guilty sinners? How can He act as he did to Paul? How can He take sinners to His heart at no cost of penalty or weary laborious penance on their part? Does not such teaching show God really indifferent to sin? Does it not proclaim that all God's threatenings against it are really without meaning? Why not go on sinning, expecting God to go on forgiving? Would not such a course really magnify His mercy? His opponents declare that this was the logical end of Paul's grace system. It would destroy the foundations of morals.

Paul's answer to this is twofold. First, from his experience, the truly forgiven man never looks at it in this way. He is ethically recreated; he has a horror

of sin whose power he has just escaped (Rom. 6:2). He can and will never return to it. His union with Christ is a union with holiness, and a pledge of final sanctification (Rom. 6, especially vs. 1-5). But Paul's second answer goes deeper and explains the above noted experience. That answer is the death of Christ. While forgiveness is freely offered the sinner, it cost God and Christ their heart's blood. This free salvation is a very precious, costly, holy thing (Rom. 3:21-25).

This view of the matter goes back to the conversion of Paul. He himself as a Pharisee had looked upon Christ as under a curse of God as proved by His crucifixion (Gal. 3:13; 1 Cor. 1:23). Now, when he sees the glorified Jesus and realizes that He is risen, as the Christians said, and that He is dwelling in the divine glory, God's own appointed Messiah and beloved Son, what shall he make of the cross? The answer, which he had doubtless heard from the Christians (1 Cor. 15:3), immediately appeared to him perfectly natural. Jesus died not for Himself, for He had no sin. He died for me. Isaiah 53 explains it all. He hung upon the accursed tree, but He bore its curse for me. And just for that reason, He is able to offer me, the guilty sinner, this free salvation. The suffering of the Saviour was a part of the Saviour's work, nay, the great thing in it, and by it He redeemed me to God, made it possible for God to give me what He otherwise could not. So God is able to maintain His justice, the moral foundation of His throne, and still pardon the guilty sinner without giving the impression of moral laxity (Rom. 3:25, 26).

Paul uses many figures to express this idea, as, redemption, sacrifice, propitiation. They belonged to

his thought world and to that of his readers, but are not to be pressed beyond the limits set by plain statements of the Apostle. Paul by these terms never meant to say that God was made favorable to sinners by the death of His Son. Rather he always teaches:

1. That God always has loved sinful men, that the cross is only the supreme expression of that grace by which Abraham and David were saved (Rom. 5:8; 8:32; 2 Cor. 5:18, 19, etc.).

2. That propitiation or appeasing is really a self-propitiation, by which God feels Himself morally enabled to do for men what He otherwise could not do for them without the gravest moral danger to them, i. e., forgive them freely.

3. To be sure Paul teaches God's wrath toward sinners, not a personal vindictive or arbitrary feeling, but the other side of holy love, without which God would make Himself *particeps criminis* with men, and would destroy the foundations of moral government. When the man changes from opposition to love, God changes from opposition to approval and delight. There is no contradiction between God's beneficent love for sinners and His opposition to them as sinners, but there is a distinction between the love of beneficence and the love of delight. It is the difference between a father's feeling toward a wayward son and his feeling toward that son when repentant, forgiven, and reconciled.

4. Neither Paul nor the New Testament ever says just how the death of Christ made it possible for God to forgive freely, but all Paul says leads directly to the conclusion that he thought the cross a disclosure of what was eternal in the heart of God, a disclosure at once of His moral integrity and His love for sinners.

The death of Jesus then was the supreme act of God's love and self-sacrifice for the salvation of men. Christ died that men might live, and, in this sense, He took their place. This made the cross central for Paul. He cannot cease to wonder at that love, to praise and thank God for it. It stirs his heart. It energizes his life. He henceforth cannot live unto himself but unto Him who for his sake died and rose again (2 Cor. 5:15). Here he advances beyond the earlier disciples, who looked upon the death of Christ as a difficulty, cancelled by the Resurrection (Acts 2:22-36). Paul apprehends it as the glory of the Christian faith (1 Cor. 2:2; Gal. 6:14) and the Resurrection as simply the divine proclamation of its validity (Rom. 4:25).

These are the foundation stones of Paul's teaching, but there are some presuppositions and sequences which we must understand. Paul's conversion gave him a new view of Jesus. He is the risen, glorified, and reigning Messiah, the beloved Son of God, who in some undefined way partakes of the divine nature. While on earth, God was in Him, and His death shows forth God's love. Paul's conversion also gave him a new view of God. He is no longer the God of legalism, the far-off stern Judge, but, though still the final Judge, He is the Father, whose Spirit dwells in our hearts and who so loved us that He spared not His own Son but delivered Him up for us all. We are His children by faith and adoption, and, as children, heirs of all the promises of God.

All men are sinners, justly under the condemnation of God. Sin does not consist merely in outward act, but is resident in the inward disposition, the thoughts and intents of the heart. Here sin rules and dominates

in spite of better feeling. Paul's major thought of sin is that of a power, a power that masters and reigns over the sinner, but his ideas of the guilt of sin and the corruption of sin are equally fundamental. The wages, the penalty, of sin, is death, by which Paul means not so much physical as spiritual death, i. e., the separation of the soul from God. So unsaved men, who have not had the experience of the new life, are looked on as even now dead in sin (Rom. 8:6; 7:9, 10, 13, 24; Eph. 2:1; 1 Tim. 5:6). Paul held strong views on the heinousness of sin, and its grip on the human soul.

The great experience of the coming of the new life is never philosophically analyzed by Paul, although he describes it from many sides and with a wealth of metaphor and illustration. It is the gift of God's love, the unspeakable, the free gift to the sinner, who deserves nothing but penalty and who has nothing to offer in pay for it. All the sinner can do is to exercise faith, i. e., believe this glad news of the free offer of life, receive it, accept it, and devote himself to the Gracious Giver, and to Christ who made the offer possible. With this comes justification, or "righteousness," a right relation to God by a free pardon, i. e., a status of right relation and gracious favor. All this, done in view of the cross, has a moral and religious power in it, divine creative energy which kills the old man and begets the new man with a new divine life which is indeed the life of God within him, sometimes called the indwelling Christ (Gal. 2:20), sometimes the indwelling Spirit (Rom. 8). This new man loves God and Christ and has in him the moral and religious energy to live a life of victory over sin. This is redemption or salvation.

This new life with Christ is offered to all, and on acceptance immediately lifts men into a higher heavenly sphere. This higher sphere is ethical; it means a moral regeneration, which is characterized by a revulsion against sin and a hatred of it. To be sure, the old character still persists. Paul calls it "the flesh," but it is no longer dominant; the real inner man, the new man, is dominant and bound in the end to be absolutely victorious. The energy of the new life is Christ or His Spirit dwelling in the heart. The new man is therefore free from the law, or any external authority as a means of salvation. His only authority is Christ, the Christ in his heart. The Godward activities of the new life are prayer, praise, and thanksgiving, as expressions of love and gratitude toward God, and the manward activities may all be summed up in love, which is the fulfilling of the law. This new life constantly bears the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22, 23) and is itself the earnest of resurrection and future glory.

Everything rests then at last on the new life in union with Christ. Paul even goes so far as to see in this new life a repetition or reproduction of the great features of the career of Jesus. As He died, so we die to sin. Our old man was crucified with Him. As He rose, so do we to newness of life (Rom. 6:5, 6). We no longer live, Christ liveth in us (Gal. 2:20). This indwelling Christ does not take the place of the renewed self in Paul, I think, but is the force which energizes it. All this is a description of the new life, in Christ or in the Spirit (used interchangeably). It is often called mystical, but Paul did not so name it. He who has felt the new life energizing in him knows what Paul means.

We see that this is heart-religion (Rom. 2:28, 29). All externals are as nothing. The whole thing is internal, personal, intimate communion with God, a vital union of life, spirit, and purpose with Christ.

Just because it is a new life, a vital heart religion, Paul was sure that it would produce the fruits of goodness, love, and self-control. This is the basis of his ethics. Consequently, he never preaches Christian ethics as a new law, to be imposed upon his disciples, but strives to nourish the new life by fresh and profound views of Christ and His salvation, assuming that thus, and thus only, will permanent and satisfactory ethical results be assured. Paul, no less than James, would declare that an unfruitful faith was dead; in fact, Paul would say that it was no faith at all. After all, Paul's greatest labor was to produce the Christian morality in his heathen converts by means of the Gospel. Here he was and is most sorely criticised. He felt it to be the critical test of the power of his Gospel, and he was always sure that the Gospel would meet the test. This is seen in every letter of Paul's, but most clearly in 1 Corinthians and the Pastoral Epistles.

Paul took large views. Jesus, His death and resurrection appeared to him the greatest events, indeed the turning point, of all history. His eye constantly sweeps from the creation to the consummation of all things. He is deeply interested in the philosophy of history, in God's great plan for the world. As in Adam all are dying, so in Christ shall all be made alive (1 Cor. 15:22). Just as surely as we die physically because of our physical connection with Adam, just so certainly will all who share Christ's spiritual life live, and live forever (Rom. 5:12-21). Paul essays the philosophy of the rise of heathenism

in Romans 1, of Israel's rejection of the Gospel in Romans 9-11, and of the lower creation's part in redemption in Romans 8:19-25, in words that sound something like those of a modern evolutionist. Colossians takes Paul into cosmology. Christ, the all-sufficient head of the church, is at the same time far above all angel powers of every kind, indeed is the creator and sustainer of all things. Ephesians only follows the same track. The universal church is here portrayed in glowing colors, and the epistle affords a glorious vista of the future of the world's history. Paul has no doubts of the final victory of the church (Phil. 2:1-11) and of Christ. Paul may be hounded and hampered, but he and all with him shall triumph. The day will come when Christ shall put down all rule and authority and power, for he must reign until He hath put all His enemies under His feet (1 Cor. 15:24, 25).

Are Jesus and Paul in fundamental agreement in their teachings? The question has been negatived by some radicals and yet seemingly without justification. There are differences. Jesus viewed almost everything with His thought upon the Kingdom of God. Paul substitutes the church for the Kingdom, and views almost everything from the standpoint of his own experience with the glorified Christ. Paul did not begin with the teachings of Jesus and develop them, as did the other apostles. Rather he began at a new point entirely and made all depend, not on the words and earthly ministry of Jesus, but on the crucified and risen Christ. There is here then a complete break and yet essential harmony.

Jesus began with a demand for a change of mind and heart (*metanoia*) and consequently a new life,

bade men enter "the narrow gate which leads to life," told Nicodemus: "Ye must be born again," and warned Peter that unless men turned and became as little children, they could not enter the Kingdom of God. Here is Paul's new creation and new life. Jesus demanded belief, the acceptance of His message, and proclaimed the forgiveness of sins full and free to penitent faith, and so did Paul. Jesus offered Himself to men as a Saviour, bade them come to Him and rest, insisted that they must share His sufferings and rejection, bade them eat of His flesh and drink of His blood, partake of His spirit and temper, and appropriate His purpose. Is not this Paul's union with Christ? Jesus thought God sent Him to save the world from sin and believed that His death was a part of that plan of salvation and essential to it, that on it the new covenant was to be founded, that He would die that others might live. Is not this Paul's thought? To be sure, he carries it further, but is his development of it in the wrong direction? Surely the evangelists put no less emphasis on Jesus' death than Paul does, and Jesus regarded it as the great act of self-sacrifice and obedience to the Father's will by which He should assure the success of His mission of salvation and found the new Israel. The differences are not essential, the harmonies between Jesus and Paul are profound.¹

But we make a great mistake if we identify Paulinism with Gentile Christianity. Paul in a sense created Gentile Christianity, and yet there were other missionaries in heathen lands as well: Barnabas,

¹The pre-existence of Christ, so often and so plainly asserted by Paul, is probably the most difficult point here, as the Synoptic Gospels are silent, or nearly silent, about it. Those who give John full credence have no trouble at this point, however.

Apollos, the men of Cyprus and Cyrene, Peter, John, and others. Moreover, all Paul's hearers and churches, nay, even all his lieutenants, did not wholly understand Paul. Paulinism came out of the conflict between the inner spirit of Pharisaism and the inner spirit of Christ. Only a Jew, and a Jew with something of Paul's experience, could appreciate his thought and feeling to the full. He doubtless influenced men profoundly who could not have told you the points of his doctrine. His enthusiasm, his love for Christ, his courage, his love for men, were contagious, and many men lit their fires from him, who only imperfectly got his point of view. This is proved by the Acts, 1 Peter, and Hebrews, which are surely Pauline in type of thought and sympathy, but which evince after all only a somewhat superficial understanding of the real teachings of Paul. This shows that Luke, Peter, and Apollos were profoundly influenced by him and yet were unable to reproduce Paulinism fully when they wrote.

If this is true of men who accompanied Paul, it is still truer of the end of the century and of the churches of the early second century. As Jewish Christianity declined rapidly in influence, and the Judaistic controversy, receding into the past, became inexplicable to Gentile Christians, Paulinism faded from men's minds (2 Pet. 3:16). The Gospels became the center of interest. A more superficial Christianity became dominant. The precepts of Christ were erected into a new law. Salvation by magic, i. e., by sacraments, began to come in. Peter began to increase and Paul to decrease. Gentile Christianity began to be Judaized and paganized. Its freedom and spontaneity began to wither under the rule of bishops and priests. Paul

was forgotten until Augustine, but Augustine's revival of Paulinism was partial and temporary at best. Finally Luther reinterpreted Paul to the world, and the world started on a new career. Heart religion, the religion of the Spirit, the new birth, faith alone, the freedom of the Christian man, became the war cries of a new age of progress, liberty, and hope. But neither Paul nor Jesus are yet fully understood. They both belong to the future rather than to the past. The coming age alone will fully appreciate them.

NEWTON CENTRE, MASSACHUSETTS.

LUKE 2:14

By WILLIAM F. OLDHAM, D. D., Corresponding Secretary, Board of
Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church

[Many Christian hearts and minds have been seriously perplexed over the discord between this mighty din of war and that sublime and hope-inspiring message of peace which has twice been so freshly brought to mind by the passing of two Christmas seasons since the great conflict opened. The song of the angels has almost seemed merely fanciful to many in the presence of "things as they are." The meditation here given may well be a source of encouragement, hope, and better understanding for such souls and to others who look to them for cheer.—EDITOR.]

"PEACE on earth among men of good will"—so the angels sang awing in the Judean sky more than nineteen hundred years ago. Earth has heard the refrain with wonder and perplexity, and yet with growing confidence and enthusiasm. For appearances have always been against the progress of the angelic program, and always it has seemed as though man of the earthly nature made but scant room for peace and good will when these were weighed against self-interest and profitable invasion of others' rights. It were idle to deny that all the centuries have recorded the fierceness of human passions, the rage and inhuman fury of the blood-lust when kindled by unholy desires and yielded to by undisciplined natures. Not least does this latest year of earth history bear witness to the fact that the brute is not yet all angel. But has not the program gone steadily forward, and even now is it not progressing spite of the roar and mirk and bitterness of widespread war?

For the matter of "peace among men of good will" is something wider and deeper than the absence of international hostilities. It might include the finding first of man, and the steady growth of the quality of good will in all his relations in life born of the good pleasure of God, and then the almost necessary sequence of peace. For men of stature who have so truly learned life that they, by the pleasure of their God, are inherently of "good will," will never find it hard to maintain universal and genuine peace. The questions we raise, therefore, are:

Is man finding himself?

As he finds himself does he discover his brother, and does "good will" grow apace as the result of a better understanding?

Is peace, genuine and universal, more surely approaching because of "men of good will"?

We think a consideration of the development of humanity and a close look into the heart of man to-day will afford abundant reason for us to continue to echo the angels' song, and to look into the face of our distracted day with the quiet assurance of well-grounded trust and hope.

For where was man when the Babe of Bethlehem was announced? What were the outstanding facts in his varied relations, in the home, in society, to the state, and to the world at large? What movement has there been in all these respects in the growth of true democracy?

In his home relations consider him then as father and husband. The relation between father and child, in the best of the civilizations when Christ came, had in it much tyrannical power. The "father of the family" ruled his household with absolute authority. His

power was unlimited, and, while natural affection was not absent, the whole bearing of the father to the child was of the kind that gained from the Apostle the admonition: "Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath." In the known world then, as in the least touched portions of the non-christian world now, filial affection was clouded by the unquestioned right of absolute authority, the will of the father as over against any reasonable regard for the judgment of even the grown child. What might have been seen in the China of yesterday, where the will of an ignorant and irascible father had entire right of way as over against the combined judgment of all the grown children of the family, was when Christ came the ordinary rule of family life.

Man, as husband, also, was the sole directing voice of all household affairs. Doubtless then, as in India to-day, the woman was not unfelt—the power of personality can never be disregarded—but this was exercised in unseen and silent ways. No question was raised as to the right of the husband to the absolute ownership of the wife and the sole direction of all family affairs.

Turn from this truly male order of society and consider how far man is finding himself in his other half, the woman, and how in the raising of future men and women the father and the mother are no longer the tyrannical directors, but the loving guides and reasoning instructors of the little people of the house. And if there be in some circles a touch of uneasiness at the too great freedom given to the children, and possibly among others a fear that this American nation at least gives undue place to the woman's influence, these fears may be dismissed in view of the great body

of good that has come to the domestic life of the nations, and the large increase of happiness and of good will within the four walls of the home that this growth of democracy has brought us, under the fostering hand of Christ, the Son of Man, in whom there is "neither male nor female," and in whom childhood has found a sympathetic and comprehending Friend.

It may be true that, as this leaven works, its first effects here and there, particularly among the less developed peoples, may be to produce headiness in the children—so China is sometimes inclined to think regarding "young China"—and even an undue assertiveness on the part of the women. But, as an Indian missionary said recently, referring to the fact that, when he was entertained by an Indian pastor, the little wife of the household monopolized all the conversation: "I remembered how silent all her mothers before her had been for a thousand years, and I thought it was surely her turn now to do all the talking." The song of the angels comes into the ears of "men" as humanity finds itself, and man and woman and child, which is man in the making, all recognize each other's rights of personality.

Man in his relation to society and the state has also been finding himself since the angels sang, for then there was no land in which a considerable proportion of the manhood was not in slavery, and even where slavery did not obtain, the privileged classes, as in India to-day, held themselves with great assumptions of superiority which went unchallenged. Slowly through the centuries the spirit of Jesus the Babe of Bethlehem has battled against this intrenchment of privilege. Through tears and bloodshed and struggle man has ceaselessly thrust upward toward the recogni-

tion of universal rights. If the whole program is far from being accomplished, nevertheless the heights have been glimpsed, and slowly but surely the great masses of mankind are pressing up the steep and difficult path to the enfranchisement and something approaching equality of privilege for all alike. Bobby Burns, the great poet of democracy, only echoed in every-day words the Christ program when he sang:

What though on hamely fare we dine,
Wear hodden gray, and a' that;
Gi'e fools their silks, and knaves their wine,
A man's a man for a' that!
For a' that, and a' that,
Their tinsel show, and a' that;
The honest man, though e'er sae poor,
Is king o' men for a' that.

The divine right of kings, the legalized oppressions of concentrated wealth, the equally undesirable oppressions of organized classes, as well as the religious oppressions and enfeebling restrictions of man-made faiths, however anchored and seemingly buttressed by centuries of presumptions, all slowly melt away and must disappear as the Christ program moves forward.

And even to-day, in the midst of the roar of war, the listening ear can detect the tramp of the coming legions, of the masses liberated by war itself into wider democracy than we have yet seen.

Man as a world citizen was unknown when the angels sang, for the people were divided into racial and tribal camps, holding each other in deepest suspicion and strongest dislike. The Roman, who at that time had overspread most of the known world, considered every non-Roman as an alien, and *alienus* easily passed in his vocabulary into *hostis*, the differ-

ence between the alien and the enemy was not marked. The Greek, who was the cultured man of that time, instinctively divided the world into "Greeks" and "barbarians," and the Jew, the religious figure of the time, separated men into "Jews" and "Gentiles," and Gentiles were not far from dogs. And so the whole known world consisted of camps despising and hating each other. More painfully slow than progress in any other direction, perhaps, has been the movement of the Christ program in this direction.

Even to-day we are told that war rages because of Teuton imperilled by Slav and Briton, or Briton and Slav threatened by the domination of Teuton, and yet is it not true that the peoples we include under these terms are largely passing in their steady, normal thinking from any such racial or national attitude? Are not these "chants of hate" and utterances of dislike confined to the few who affect to represent the many? And have not the many been cruelly deceived by these utterances of the few, and is not the whole scheme of mutual animosity engendered and fostered by mistaken leaders already beginning to be discovered by the plain people? And will there not be a very great rebirth of international appreciation and good will when this day is over? Is one wrong in believing and asserting that increasing masses of people in all lands are being persuaded that in their common sufferings they are finding closer bonds of fellowship that are greater than all those matters which they were told were reasons for hatred and war?

An English mother, who had lost one of her sons and had just bidden farewell to another son on his way to the Dardanelles, writes concerning the recent taking of the German trenches, and says: "We are

told that the Germans suffered severely. Oh! their poor mothers! When will this war be over, and Germans and English alike not have their hearts broken and their souls wrung?"

Racial hatreds are disappearing in community of suffering and a sense of brotherhood among the masses is growing, faster than their leaders would care to admit. When on Christmas Day, 1914, Germans and Britons were permitted to spend a few hours together, it became necessary to change the units that were in contact with each other because the men had already learned fellowship to be stronger than war hatred. When peoples finding themselves assert themselves as over against any military caste or hereditary aristocracy there will come in Europe, and ultimately throughout the world, that which we already see in America, this great melting pot of the nations, where Teuton and Slav, Briton and Austrian and Italian all live together, commingling in ideals and in tasks and in aspirations until in a little while it is hard to tell the whence of any, so utterly is it subordinated to the whither of all.

Now if this be the actual course of the centuries, and if, spite of all obstacles, the program has gone forward, if men are finding themselves, and finding themselves are finding their brother man, with the sequel of the growth of good will, can we not hear the whole anthem of the angels and repeat it without hesitation and with assured hope—"Peace on earth"? What else can there be on earth when man discovers himself, and the brotherhood of man is the sequel?

But if the text should mean "peace on earth among men of good will," meaning God's good will, so that the passage may mean peace among men in whom

God is well pleased, there would stand out even more vividly the greater aptness of the angels' song. For all these matters to which we have already referred can be brought about only through the Christ, who when He comes into the hearts and lives of men gives them both their sense of personal worth as the sons of God and the ability to discover worth in all their brothers, for whom also Christ came, for whom He lived and suffered, and for whom He died. God is well pleased with men only when they become conformed to the image of His Son, whom He sent so that He might show them the lineaments of Heaven in a human face on earth. The coming of the Babe into the human life was the opening of the door into the life from which the Babe came to all babes that should be born in this troubled world. The secret of all earth's disquiet is its ignorance, and its variance from the life of Heaven.

But when the life of Heaven was born into the earth in the Bethlehem Babe, the way was opened for that life to enter the hearts of all the children of men and so provide for the pleasing of God with men reborn—born not only of the disquiet of earth, but reborn of the restfulness of Heaven.

And so the skies grow bright with the angel host, we hear again the angels sing, and once more 'mid all distractions we look longingly for the accomplishment of the program which has steadily moved on, and which shall be fulfilled—men of good will, pleasing to God, found in fellowship with each other, the ground of peace universal.

"Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth among men of good will."

THE COUNTRY CHURCH

By REV. PAUL DWIGHT MOODY, Pastor of the South Congregational Church, St. Johnsbury, Vermont

A DAILY paper recently stated that one of the leading denominations in this country was about to prepare some of its candidates for ordination for the work of the country ministers as distinguished from that of the average minister. The paper went on to say that they were to be prepared for this as the denomination was determined to grapple with the problem of the rural church.

Our interest for the moment is not so much in the step this church is taking as in the assumption that there is such a thing as the rural church problem. It always saves time, at the beginning of a discussion, to define terms, and it will be instructive to see what is meant by the rural church problem. The wise man who is prepared to answer this would also be willing to tell us the solution. But he would be halted at this point until he had enlightened us as to the whereabouts of the typical church. Is it north or south or east or west? Human nature is the same all the world over, but that is exactly what complicates the proposition, for economic conditions are not, and these different conditions mean different phases and perplexities in the work of a church. If no two leaves are alike and no two individuals, how can we expect two churches to be? Within the past month the writer, visiting a group of rural churches to which he was delegated, found in four days four churches, each strong in its own way but each wrestling with an altogether different set of perplexities.

Surely it is wiser to speak of the problems of the rural church rather than the problem, or as though the matter could be stated in one word. The men who are really solving the problem, as far as there is one, are to a man unconscious of the problem as such, but are very busy indeed with a multitude of small and vexatious problems. They are not writing essays about the problem or generalizing—as I am trying not to do. The problem before the rural pastor is how to get this man into church membership and that man out of it, without the afflicting spectacle of a church quarrel. He is busier with plans for new horse sheds than with any for improving the status of the country church, and speculations as to the best thing for the denomination to do yield to the deliberation upon getting his church onto a firm financial plan.

It is doubtful if a detailed examination of one hundred or even one thousand country ministers would yield anything like a clear answer as to what was *the* problem of the country church. And if by chance an answer were obtained which was nearly general, there is great likelihood that it would be wrong. The question as to *the* problem is as unreasonable as is the discussion of how to reach the masses. There is no one way. At least the Master gave us no clew to one, but seemed Himself content to work for individuals. The mass has no soul to save—only the individual. And to talk about the problem of the rural church is only to indulge in a great American weakness, a fondness for generalities.

But the *problems* are real enough. For our purposes here we will divide them into terrestrial and celestial—economic and spiritual. And the first economic problem, at any rate in the East (and let

it be said at the start that I have no wish to try to speak of conditions of which I have no knowledge, and I know only the East), is the cityward drift. One hundred years ago not far from 85 to 90 per cent. of the population of this country resided in the country. Now, despite enormous increases both in the inhabited territory and in the population itself, something like 47 per cent. live in the city. And all the time the tide seems to set more strongly toward the city. We are all familiar with the story of the abandoned farms in New England and shrinkage in population. It is claimed, though I have not the figures to prove it, that in Vermont, apart from the towns or "walled cities," there is not a single community that does not show a smaller population now than before the Civil War.

This is deplorable, and the church has felt it more keenly than any other institution. No one but the pastor of a small church knows what it means to see the young man or woman, after a college course perhaps, go off to the city, there to give the large church the help so sadly needed in the small. The pastor had looked forward to this young man becoming the superintendent of the Sunday School. He had prayed for this ever since the youth went away to college, and he reconciled himself to missing him for the four years at college because he looked ahead and saw the good he was to do. This hope is shattered, but no one can blame the youth for seizing opportunity when the chance came. It may comfort the pastor a little to feel that all the training and inspiration the young man had came from the little country church, but it is rather cold comfort for the minister who needs him so badly.

The minister watches the young woman who served as organist and choir leader marry and move away to a larger center. Her ability along musical lines may not have been great, and her technique may have been small, but she could conceal the aberrations of the superannuated bass and reduce to a minimum the discord of the volunteer and untrained choir. But in the larger church to which she may go there is plenty of better talent than hers, and she drops out of service and finally out of the church altogether. For in the old church she felt herself someone and of some use, but with the loss of this habit of being of use goes the impulse to worship at all. It is hard beyond words for the pastor and clerk to see, year after year, letter after letter sent to the cities, and the best and brightest young blood subtracted from the life of the small church where it is needed so greatly, sometimes only to be poured out in waste and sometimes to be added to the already strong life of some large church. Like the Minotaur of old, the city keeps up its demand for young blood, and, like that fabled monster, it is satisfied with only the best youths and maidens. The failures are apt to creep back and the weaklings to remain anyhow. This is one problem, and surely it is great enough. Yet it is far from *the* problem.

Another economic problem the country church has on its hands is the nearly inevitable tendency to stagnation to be found in the country and so in the church. It is quite likely that there are as many people in ruts in the city as in the country, but they are not so easily observed, and the rut is apt to be a little wider, if deeper. A rut has been well called a grave with both ends extended, and it certainly means pretty much the same thing as death, save as we remember that while

there is life there is hope. Many a brave man has at last wilted under a ceaseless repetition of: "We have never done that," and "We have always done it this way, and I guess we had better not change," varied perhaps with the cowardly adage: "Let well enough alone." Many an institution continues after all vitality has disappeared. Dead but unburied things are a menace as great in the moral as in the physical world. The prayer meeting which has ceased to minister to the needs of the people but is continued none the less and the evening service which is cold and lifeless the people may positively refuse to surrender, even though they will not support or work for them. At the same time they do not want any innovations. The city is more apt to make confession of failure than is the country, and the form there that does not minister to the need is more apt to be dropped. There are parts of the country where the deference to the past is nearly Chinese in its approach to idolatry. Along with this conservatism and stagnation goes, hand in hand, a dreadful tendency to degeneracy and poverty. Of these I prefer not to speak. But there are tales—and I have listened to them in the jail and in the courthouse—which are dreadful beyond words.

I had occasion lately to travel nearly all day with a missionary from Africa who, by the doctor's orders, is spending the winter in this country. In order not to be idle he has taken a charge for the winter in a New England rural community. It was a long coveted opportunity, and I asked him if he found the work easier in this country than in Africa. His answer did not surprise me, but I wish that it could have the wide publicity it deserves. For to him there was no comparison, and it was easier to work, he said, in Africa

among savages than in this country among reputed Christians. The black night of ignorance was more easily dispelled, to his way of thinking, than the darker night of indifference and callousness. I believe him. Happily there are brighter sides and there are communities as wide awake and as progressive in the country as in the urban centers. There can now and again be found even in New England, whose chapter some think is written and closed, little towns supporting churches that are strong and useful and doing in their way as good work as any widely known city church. Some of these are in farming communities, and there the young men have been kept on the farms not by force but because the farm promised them something and there was a future for them. In churches in places of this kind you will find as many young men as old, if not actually more.

This leads us to see that there are some places and churches which have not surrendered in this fight. They have said that if the problem was economic somewhere there must be an economic solution for it. The future has great prospects for the country. And as the church has shared in the misfortune in the unhappy past, so she will share in the good fortune of the future, if she only keeps her place in the service of the people. There has been a widespread and welcome consideration, both definite and in the main intelligent, over the causes for the depopulation of the countryside. For everyone sees that the nation suffers if the country is allowed to go back to waste. We have been told of the unspeakable monotony of the farmer's life in winter, and that more farmers' wives go insane than people of any other class. The reason has been made clear why so many young people refused to stay

on the farm. All this has been laid at the door of the unfavorable country conditions, and rightly, too.

Every day, however, will see this bettered. The coming of the telephone has done much, and the free delivery and the parcels post are doing more. But of the factors which have done most, the first place belongs to the automobile. The improvement in roads is entirely due to this. The automobile is now within the reach of every farmer, not perhaps as a pleasure vehicle but as a means of transportation and a matter of necessity. Indeed, a farmer can hardly afford to be without one. It is usual to think and speak of the automobile as though it interfered with church attendance, but a saner view is to realize that in many scattered communities it is the only means whereby some can ever get to church. The automobile must be used in the service of God. A part of the work of the minister in some communities is to see that certain things are pressed into the service of God that in the past have been wrongly considered the special servants of His arch enemy. All these things will make life on the farm a very different thing from what it was a generation ago, and it is to be hoped in consequence that many a boy and girl will stay, who a few years ago would have surrendered to the call of the city. And in this, as we have said, the church will reap a great benefit.

If these things have made the farmhouse a pleasanter home, at the same time a better understanding of agriculture is making the farm more profitable as well. There was a time when intensive agriculture did not make the appeal it does now since the cost of living has risen so greatly, and when, in view of cheaper labor, the farmer was not driven to such efforts

to make both ends meet. As long as there were large tracts of land unclaimed in the West, land of incredible fertility, the need of scientific agriculture was not felt. But now conditions have changed. The land has gradually been taken up, and the farm has replaced the ranch and the range. And at the same time we have learned that, with the proper methods, the stories of fabulous profits that we have heard from the West could be duplicated here by the genius who saw the need and was first to supply it. Many a man has done as well on the supposedly barren and worn-out Eastern farm as his brother has done on the Western prairie. But he has had to have knowledge and insight to do so, and this the agricultural colleges have been supplying. This is the day of the Babcock test and the chemical analysis of the soil, the milking machine and the separator.

And a great many lovers of agriculture and the country church have come forward and declared that there was a way out of Egypt, and that if only the church took the lead in the dissemination of a scientific knowledge of agriculture she would win back her old place and again we would see the horse shed full of a Sunday, and everything would be satisfactorily solved. Indeed, the very newspaper article, to which reference was made at first, said that a scientific knowledge of farming was to be given to all the men that this church was preparing for country parishes. This statement could come only from a rather reckless newspaper man on the one hand or a rather visionary and impractical theologian on the other. There are many men who can absorb a knowledge of agronomy far better than they can of apologetics. There are others whose knowledge of Hebrew roots will not be impaired by being mixed

with a knowledge of other kinds of roots as well. A knowledge of the proper rotation of crops for some men and some parishes would be as useful as a knowledge of the councils of the church. But on the whole the wisdom of this is very far from obvious.

In the first place, a partial knowledge is always apt to be dangerous and to no one more so than to a minister, and of no subject, with the possible exception of those we associate with the healing art, is an amateur's knowledge less useful, if not positively more dangerous, than of farming. The regular course that the man pursues who can present a diploma in agriculture is no easy one and can hardly be carried on amid the studies necessary to become a competent leader in matters spiritual. The idea that anybody can be a farmer and that farming is simple and that a correspondence course will equip the student for an advisership in matters agricultural is so erroneous that it is not even worth stopping to disprove. The magazines that encourage the return to the country on the part of city folk tell the exceptional, if not apocryphal, yarns about the men who do succeed, but they say nothing of the many who lose their all. The minister has not the time to devote to becoming the kind of expert he must be if he hopes to give advice on land drainage and cattle breeding to men who have spent their lives at it.

And, in the second place, the day has nearly gone by when the minister can do this. The old prejudice against the scientific farmer is fast disappearing, and there are many counties where the farmers have an agricultural expert who gives his services free to all who belong to the local farmers' associations. It is all wrong to think that the old stock figure of the

comic paper is in any way now a portrait of the man who, after all, is the main figure in American life, without whom the greatest city would starve in a week and for whom the railroads run and the factories operate. Where the old prejudice does exist it is not going to be removed by advice from the minister. If there is a problem of the country church, assuredly it is not going to be solved by putting the minister into overalls or confusing his mind with all the puzzling statistics of a mixed or balanced ration. The minister is in the community for the upraising of Christian character and not for the raising of improved or registered calves.

Moreover, it is very doubtful if his congregation will ever allow him to forget this. If the minister is a success it will be because he preaches the Gospel in a way that moves and helps men and because he is a good adviser with respect to the things that fall in his sphere, and above all, because he is a good and trustworthy and lovable man. If he is a success he does not need any agricultural activities or interests to fill his time or to commend him to a congregation only too ready to open their doors and their hearts to him. But if, in the great task for which he comes among them, he fails, he cannot rehabilitate himself by telling them how to make their hens lay or what to do to cure rust in asparagus. We are apt to be doubtful of the lawyer who dabbles in medicine, as we conclude that his law studies must have suffered somewhat if he has had time to devote to medicine. At the same time we are not overconfident as to his knowledge of medicine.

There may be some injustice in the statement that the jack-of-all-trades is master of none, but the old statement is founded on long observation. So with

the minister. If he can interpret Isaiah he will not need to know how to cure ensilage; but if he cannot, no amount of knowledge on the latter subject will atone for the former omission. If it is found that he thinks he knows something that he does not, then there is grave danger of his being suspected of not knowing other and more important things as well. A story has made the rounds of the papers of the Reverend Dry-as-dust who asks a drunken countryman the way to a neighboring village. The reply is so overseasoned with profanity that the grieved gentleman points out that the rustic is on the way to extreme punishment. The reply was that as this stranger did not know the way to the next village even, what could he possibly know about the way to hell. There is, of course, a great fallacy here, but since human nature never has been very logical we need not give it any more occasion to stumble than is unavoidable.

The whole fallacy of this movement to instruct the minister in farm economy and to try to make him an expert is well illustrated by the remark a friend in a neighboring town made to me. He is one of the most useful and efficient ministers in the state. Speaking one day of one of his parishioners, he made the remark that this man had recently sold a cow at a figure, if I remember correctly, in excess of what he himself receives for his yearly salary. At this time a book had lately been published by two investigators in these fields who were enthusiastically certain that this was the way out, and that the only solution of the "country problem" was agricultural education. My friend dryly remarked as he spoke of the matter: "I suppose so-and-so would have me go and give that man a little advice on how to increase the supply of milk."

We do not want to be spoken to with authority by the agricultural expert on matters in the Old Testament, on the ground that there is much that is agricultural and pastoral in that, and I doubt if we make any headway as ministers by attempting to invade a field that is becoming more highly specialized every year.

After all, the deepest problems of the country church are not economic but spiritual. And it is always harder to speak with positiveness in this field where only God knows and sees clearly. It is doubtful if in a great many matters there is much difference between the problems that the minister in a small country church and a small city church have to face.

When I was a mere lad in my old home in Massachusetts I used to be sent every Sunday to carry a preacher to a small schoolhouse where were held the only religious services that community had. Later I was assigned the task of seeing that it had preachers and was made responsible for the services there. Desperate attempts used to be made to interest the community in these services. It took a speaker of almost national reputation to get an audience out, and that kind were not preaching there—often. As I used to worry over this problem it finally came to shape itself for me in this way: The weaker the place the stronger the man needed. Kipling has put in the mouth of one of his keenest characters, Mrs. Hauksbee, the statement that any woman can manage a wise man, but that it takes a very wise woman to manage a fool. The same thing is true of churches. The average man can manage the average church, but it takes a spiritual genius and a saint of more than common caliber to manage the small church with its lack of workers and the loss which comes when the momentum of numbers

is lacking. But it is not only the smaller the church the bigger the man, but the smaller the church the less money there is for a poor man, let alone a man that is really of value to his day and generation.

As I used to wonder at the problem as a boy, brought face to face with it in a concrete form, it seemed to me that there was no solution. After many years I am a minister myself, and though not in the strictest sense a country minister, since the church I have the honor to serve is in a town of over 8,000 population, still it is a country community all about us, and I am privileged to know well many of the splendid men who for shamefully small sums are working at this problem or problems (instead of writing about them). But I see no more now than then any solution of the problem as a problem. But now I am not certain that a solution is needed. We are all apt to wish for some one word to open doors, as in the old fairy tales, and to solve for us all secrets. The word is lacking and always will be, save in realms of fancy. As I write, in a thousand and one small country churches the problem is being solved for this and that church and field for this year. But the very methods that are being worked out so well in these churches are doing nothing in other churches. And where a difficulty is not being solved it is often because discontent has crept in and the minister is feeling dissatisfied and is lifting up his eyes to other fields and envying the laborers there the splendid stand of grain, forgetting that back of this was the planting and the watering and the silent growth and the faithful tending.

It is in the realm of the spiritual, but it is not *the* problem any more than any others have been, but it is

a problem, and an important one, that so many are allowed to think slightly of the work of the country church. The seminaries are the chief offenders in this, for too often the student, even there, comes to think of the country field as too small or too insignificant for his powers. And if by chance he finds himself at the close of his seminary course obliged to take a small field, because a blind world has not been awake to what he can do for it, too often he looks upon this as but a stepping stone to advancement.

England can teach us a lesson here, for she has found a way to keep some of her great men in places that needed them sorely. Who can forget that Kingsley, with all his gifts, remained to the end the vicar of the little church of Eversley? And the world is richer, as well as Bremerton, for the fact that in an earlier generation George Herbert found enough to do there and so stayed on and transformed this wickedest of little places into a paradise and incidentally found time to serve the world and more than his own day by the poems he wrote and the songs he sung.

All honor to the humble man who turns his back on all chances of fame and fortune and chooses to serve God where he feels he best can. But the church at large could help him in his loneliness and sense of isolation and separation from the larger world, which threatens his usefulness and self-respect sometimes, if it found ways to make him feel that in his remote corner he was not forgotten and that the work he was doing was noted and cared for by more than the few who hear his faithfully prepared sermons. Teach the student that it is not disgraceful to serve many years in the small field; but at the same time find a way to bring some sense of service to the larger world to the

man who stays in the small place. Let the pulpits of the larger churches be open to him now and then, and let him feel that the fact that he is a servant of the King is of such dignity that it is of lesser importance where he serves.

COLLATERAL READINGS ON THE INTERNATIONAL SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS

May 7. The Missionaries of Antioch. Acts 11:19-30; 12:25-13:12.

- I. Context and connection. Read Acts 8:1-5 in connection with 11:19 to get scope of the movement; also Luke 24:44-49.

Verse 19: (a) Phoenicia (Acts 21:2; 11:9). Compare Matthew 15:21. (b) Cyprus (Acts 21:3 with map). (c) Antioch. (Acts 13:14 and references).

Verse 20: (d) Cyrene (note 13:1). Matthew 27:32; Acts 2:10 (with map).

- II. The mission of Barnabas.

(a) Barnabas himself (Acts 4:36, 37; 9:27).

(b) His mission. Compare Acts 11:1-18.

Verses 27-28. Compare 13:1.

- III. Prophets in early church. Read 1 Corinthians 12:4-11; 14:26-33, 37-39.

- IV. Aid to church at Jerusalem (11:29, 30; 13:1f). Read Romans 15:25-27 and references.

- V. Saul and Barnabas. Read Acts 9:27; 15:22f and references.

May 14. Lo, We Turn to the Gentiles. Acts 13:13-52.

- I. The church in the synagogue. Read James 1:1, comparing this with John 10:16; 12:20; Matthew 8:11, etc.

- II. Steps in the enlargement of the church. Read Acts 2:39; 3:12f; 6:1-6; 8:4-25; 8:26-40; 9:15; 10:1-48; 11:19-29; 12:25-13:12; 13:13-52; 15:1-29.

May 21. The Cripple of Lystra. Acts 14.

- I. Iconium and Lystra. Note that according to 14:6 the boundary between Phrygia and Lycaonia lay between Iconium and Lystra, making Iconium the last city of Phrygia and Lystra the first of the bordering province. This is correct.
- II. The miracle. Compare Matthew 9:27-29.
- III. The result (for identification of apostles as gods see Ramsay, *Bearings of Recent Discovery on New Testament*, p. 46f). Read Acts 17:22-31.

May 28. The Council at Jerusalem. Acts 15:1-35.

- I. The meaning of the discussion. Read Galatians 3:1-14; Romans 1:1-16; Revelation 1:4-8.
- II. The meaning of the decision of the council. Read Galatians 2:1-10.
- III. The place of the Holy Spirit in the early church (vs. 8, 28). Read John 16:7-15; Acts 2:1-21, and references.

June 4. The Call of the West. Acts 15:36-16:15.

- I. The separation of Paul and Barnabas.
 - (a) After history. See 2 Corinthians 8:18, 19 (considered by some to refer to Barnabas); 1 Corinthians 9:6; Galatians 2:13.

- (b) Mark and Paul. See Colossians 4:10; Philemon 24; 1 Peter 5:13; 2 Titus 4:11.

II. The wider field for Paul.

- (a) For places in Asia Minor (vs. 6-10) see maps.
- (b) On Macedonia read Acts 19:21; Romans 15:26; 2 Corinthians 9:2, and references.

III. Paul's companions.

- (a) Silas (=Silvanus). See preceding verse 32. Read 2 Corinthians 1:19; Acts 18:5; 1 Thessalonians 1:1; 2 Thessalonians 1:1; 1 Peter 5:12.
- (b) Timothy. Read 1 Timothy 1:1, 2; 2 Timothy 1:3-14.
- (c) Luke (beginning of "we" section, v. 10). Read Luke 1:2; Colossians 4:14; 2 Timothy 4:11.

June 11. Whitsuntide Lesson. The Revealing of the Spirit. 1 Corinthians 2.

- I. The Holy Spirit as the source of power (v. 4) in preaching. Read John 16:8-11, noticing particularly the connection of "unto you" (v. 7b) and "when he is come" (v. 8) with what follows.
- II. The Holy Spirit as the revealer of God. Read Isaiah 61:1; Ezekiel 2:2; 2 Corinthians 3:17, and cross references.
- III. The Holy Spirit as spirit of faith in the Christian life (v. 13). Read Romans 8:1-11; 1 Corinthians 12:3.

June 18. The Philippian Jailer. Acts 16:16-40.

- I. The "spirit of divination." (1 Samuel 28:7-9; 1 Chronicles 10:13; Deuteronomy 18:14, and references.)
- II. In the name of Jesus Christ (v. 18). Read John 14:13, 14; 16:23-27, and references.
- III. The riot and accusation. Read Acts 19:23-34; Luke 23:1-5.
- IV. The punishment (vs. 22-24). Read 2 Corinthians 11:23-27. For Paul's standing as a Roman and the law respecting it, compare verses 37, 38, with Acts 22:22-29.
- V. The jailer's conversion. Read Luke 19:1-10; 23:39-43.

June 25. Review. The Philippian Christians. Philippians 1:1-11; 4:1-9.

- I. For the *personal* relationship of Paul to the Christian believers elsewhere (vs. 5, 8). Read 1 Thessalonians 1:2-9; 2:1-12.
- II. Paul's visits to Philippi and the character of the Philippian church. (Acts 16:6f; Acts 20:4-6; 2 Corinthians 8:1, 2; Acts 19:22; 2 Corinthians 2:13; 7:5, 6; 8:1, and references.)

July 2. Paul at Thessalonica and Beroea. Acts 17:1-15.

- I. The message (vs. 1-3). Read 1 Thessalonians 2:1-10; Romans 1:1-7.

I. The converts (v. 4). Read 1 Thessalonians 5; Acts 17:32-34.

II. The Bereans (v. 11). Read Joshua 1:1-9; Psalm 1.

July 9. The Thessalonian Christians. 1 Thessalonians 1; 2:17-20; 4:13-18.

I. Their earnestness and sincerity (vs. 2-7). Read Romans 5:1-5; James 1:2-4; Revelation 1:9.

II. Paul's delight in them (2:17-20). Read Matthew 19:29; Philippians 4:1.

III. Their immortal hope (4:13-18). Read for comparison, 2 Thessalonians 2:1-12; 1 Corinthians 15:20-28.

July 16. Paul at Athens. Acts 17:16-34.

I. Idolatry at Athens. Read (in the order given) Isaiah 40:1-26; Deuteronomy 16:21, 22; Exodus 32:7-8; Exodus 20:4; Genesis 35:2-4.

II. Paul's gracious tactfulness (vs. 22, 23). Read 1 Corinthians 1:1-9; Acts 26:2, 24-29; 1 Corinthians 9:18-23.

III. Paul's theism (vs. 24-28). Read Isaiah 40:1-31, especially 12-17 and 27-31.

July 23. Paul at Corinth. Acts 18:1-22.

I. The population of Corinth (vs. 1-4, 7, 8). Read Romans 16:21-23; 1 Corinthians 16:17.

II. Jewish opposition and Paul's plan (vs. 5, 6). Read again 13:13-52 and readings there given.

- III. Paul's vision and duty (vs. 9, 10). Read Acts 9:1-10; 26:12-20, and cross references.
- IV. Paul's stay at Corinth (v. 11). Read 1 Thessalonians 3:4-7; 1 Corinthians 1:14, 26; 2 Thessalonians 1:4; 2 Corinthians 1:1; Romans 16:1; 1 Corinthians 2:3; 1 Corinthians 2:1-5; 1 Corinthians 4:15; 2 Corinthians 6:13; 1 Thessalonians 2:15, 16.
- V. Paul's writing at Corinth. (1 Thessalonians 1:1; 2 Thessalonians 1:1; 1 Thessalonians 3:6; 2 Thessalonians 2:2.)
- July 30.* The Word of the Cross. 1 Corinthians 1:1-2:5.
- I. The salutation of the epistle (vs. 1-3). Read Romans 1:1-7; 2 Corinthians 1:1, 2; Galatians 1:1-5.
- II. Exhortation to unity. Read Philippians 2:1-11.
- III. The message of the cross (vs. 18-25). Read John 12:20-36; Romans 1:8-17.
- IV. The Gospel of the humble (1:26-2:5). Read Amos 1:1; 7:14-16, with Matthew 11:2-6; Luke 4:16-21; Isaiah 61:1-3.

LITERARY REVIEWS

[Authors and publishers are requested not to send either books, periodicals or pamphlets for review. The editors prefer to select and purchase whatever is to be reviewed in these pages. EDITORS.]

'THEOLOGY IN CHURCH AND STATE'

PRINCIPAL FORSYTH'S volume has more than one hallmark of an epoch-making book. Whether the reader shall regard it in that light or not may depend upon his personal predilections. Yet, all private bias aside, no one can handle this book without feeling a thrill of power in his mental and moral nerves. For one thing it is a noble example of sustained and exalted rhetoric. Masters of style might charge it with frequent redundancy, but the composition is never turgid or insincere. One feels that its eloquence—where there are many eloquent passages—is spiritual. The quality of the subject is reflected in the tone and form of utterance. It belongs to that type of literature, all too infrequent, that Quincey characterized as the literature of power.

Dr. Forsyth's English alone is worth studying. It is of the secular sort—bleeding thought. It is good practice reading such a book. Not only does it make one think with the top of his head, but it brings one also into a fine and wholesome atmosphere of clear and exalted thinking. One feels like standing on tiptoe to reach it. One has a feeling in reading it of having fallen heir to something true and worthy. This is in part an effect of the sincere and weighty style of the book. So much might be said about its outward impressiveness without attempting a verdict upon its real inward message. True students of language, however, well understand that qualitative language predicates vitalized thought. The values of the book might be suspected even by a casual reader from certain selected sentences that are more than epigrams: "It

¹Theology in Church and State, by Peter Taylor Forsyth, M. A., D. D., Principal of Hackney College, London. London and New York, 1916. Pp. 328.

is the hour of the tangential mind." "It is not possible just to rub on in a religion like Christianity." "Preachers themselves tend to read books of religion rather than to study theology." "The great confessions are in their nature great odes." One feels the touch of mastery in sayings such as these.

The real power of the book is in its vital and constructive faith. The author, as Henry Ward Beecher said of Charles Hodge, is "a tremendous believer." Our age is no time for namby-pamby in faith. Therefore, the author's burden is the church, its condition, its supernatural character, its destiny. He is at times the sharp critic of conditions, but more than all he is the profound student of antecedent truths and principles. The church, in his view, is the vehicle of a new and creative life that is distinctly supernatural in its origin. "The church is more than an organization; it is an organism." It is a corporate personality, inbreathed of the new creative life of God. It is altogether the most vital spiritual organism known among men. Its unity too (yet to be realized) is the most real and valuable potency conceivable for human welfare. "It is more than a sympathetic unity or a contractual, more mystic and wonderful; it is the unity of a corporate personality indwelling and creative; a unity whose bond is not provided by organization but by an organizing life." This conception of the church is like a breath from the high hills clearing its way amidst the miasms of world-thinking about the church.

The author evidently never has the problem of Establishment out of mind. He is painfully aware of the havoc wrought upon the church's sense of its corporate personality, or to use a less technical term, its loss of spirituality. But the need is not limited to the confines of the Establishment. Everywhere indeed the church needs to recover a distinctive faith in its spiritual and collective personality, and this in truth is "the first condition and the only plea for demanding from such a moral personality as the state that respect which is its due recognition of the church's unique life and liberty." For it is quite clear that when Disestablishment has been accomplished, there still remains the question of relation between church and state. They cannot stand opposed to one another, neither can they be indifferent. "The absolute neutrality of church and state is morally and spiritually impossible." Especially is this true in a country with a history like England's.

the church be a high spiritual personality, the state is certainly true moral personality. They serve the same ends, no less than Kingdom of God. "The powers that be are ordained of God." What is needed in the churches is that "they should become churches again." Their unity should become a unity of churches, not merely of curdled spirituality." It is Christ indwelling in the church by His Spirit that gives the church its unique spiritual personality. This sense of its own great life and possibility the church must itself find again. It must live its conviction of a God-given charter. It must express the new creative life by which it was formed.

From this point of view the author sees in strong light the need of creeds. The supreme spiritual peril that threatens Christianity to-day is the recurrence of Gnosticism. "And it can never be countered by those whose abstract idealism or prickly atomism insists a creed in every form and use." It is to be regretted that Principal Forsyth thought it needful to employ the term dogma to describe the irreducible Gospel of our faith. His plea for the term is beside the mark. Nevertheless his plea for the central Gospel that is to be preached (call it what one may) is charged with the highest sincerity and eloquence. We are not called to-day to dogmatize about dogma. "We must concentrate and dogmatize on the Gospel as Rome does on the church." There is therefore no future for a church that has lost its own sense of vital relationship, and has grown timid about its "dogma" and negligent of its creed. The church cannot be merely pragmatic; it must live upon its beliefs.

EDGAR WHITAKER WORK.

PROFESSOR LADD'S PHILOSOPHIC QUADRILATERAL¹

GREET you at the beginning of a great career, which yet must have had a long foreground somewhere for such a start." (Emerson to Walt Whitman.)

The foregoing words are altogether appropriate to Professor Ladd in view of these latest volumes from his busy brain and pen,

¹What Can I Know? 1914. Pp. 320; What Ought I to Do? 1915. Pp. 322; What Should I Believe? 1915. Pp. 292; What May I Hope? 1915. Pp. 326, by George Trumbull Ladd, New York.

except that the "foreground" for this new and striking development lies not obscurely "somewhere," but in the full light which shines upon public and honorable achievement. The four modest volumes which now lie before us for review cover the fields of knowledge, belief, moral conduct, and hope. They constitute a new and striking departure in so far as they involve a more condensed and popular mode of treatment than is to be found in his previous works. Hitherto, we take it, Professor Ladd, at least in his major treatises, has been a teacher of teachers, a leader of trained and more or less expert investigators. Here the great psychologist and philosopher makes a distinct and notable bid for a popular hearing. As it is notoriously perilous for a philosopher of the first class to mount the popular rostrum, it becomes the reviewer's duty at the outset to gauge the success of the undertaking. This duty, for once, it is a pleasure to fulfil.

The writer of this review began the study of Professor Ladd's works in college days more than twenty-five years ago. The intervening period covers the greater part of Professor Ladd's career of authorship, during which he has produced and given to the public over twenty volumes on subjects ranging from Church Polity to the Philosophy of Religion. In this notable series of treatises Professor Ladd has once and again transcended the ordinary limits of specialization in that his knowledge in many fields exhibits the fulness of detail and technical accuracy of the expert. This is notably true in his mastery of the allied and yet quite distinct fields of philosophy and psychology. His works in both these subjects are detailed and technical, and are widely recognized by masters of reflection as profound and original contributions to human thought.

On the whole, however, notwithstanding the solidity and permanent value of the more elaborate treatises referred to above, we are strongly of the opinion that in many respects Professor Ladd's most notable intellectual achievement is to be found in these four volumes. The reasons for this statement lie altogether apart from the general and patent fact that the production within two years of four well-written volumes on serious subjects is a notable piece of work for a man past seventy years of age. Aside from such general considerations we maintain, after careful study and no little detailed comparison, that Professor Ladd has advanced beyond any

previous work in many particulars of insight, in coherence of systematic interpretation, most notably in felicitous illustration and clear, untechnical expression. His whole philosophic activity has become warmer and more human, and has burst into a summerlike fullness both of bloom and fruit.

His qualifications as a leader of thought are many and notable. In the first place, he knows the problem which reflective thought is trying to solve. In so saying we have said far more than appears on the surface. The almost irresistible tendency in philosophy is to oversimplify the problem and to reduce the vastness and complexity of the world to a false and abstract unity. Most philosophic systems are inadequate rather than false. But to be inadequate there is to be false. Philosophy is never so misleading as when it gets out of touch with the irreducible complexity of reality. Professor Ladd again and again warns us back from the edge of an abyss, over which mere syllogistic reasoning would thrust us, by opportunely widening the induction and redressing the balance. He recalls us to renew our contact with life.

Second, Professor Ladd knows what men have thought about the great problem. By this we do not mean simply that he is thoroughly read in philosophy. Far more than this, he knows literature in an almost encyclopedic sense, and he knows both science and common life profoundly. His quotations, references, illustrations, are amazingly copious and still more strikingly appropriate and illuminating. He has winnowed his vast stores of knowledge and given us the finest of the wheat.

Third, Professor Ladd's most striking characteristic as a thinker is his balance of judgment. He is a keen, and sometimes severe, critic and yet is wonderfully genial in his recognition of truth in systems which he rejects. He synthesizes partial or one-sided interpretations, avoids extremes, keeps his feet and ours in the main highways of thought and experience. His sanity is particularly noticeable with reference to idealism and realism, agnosticism and overconfidence, authority and individualism. (See *What Should I Believe?* pp. 117 ff.) It is remarkable that one so idealistic in temper and so enthusiastic in his response to moral and spiritual conceptions should at the same time be so sympathetic in his attitude toward the aims and methods of physical science. It is reassuring to follow the thought of one

who is free from the earmarks of sect or school, and yet who is no undisciplined lancebreaker who rides at will and challenges all whom he meets. In this connection we would call especial attention to the imaginary colloquy at the close of the first volume (*What Can I Know?* pp. 304 ff). Near the end of that dialogue, conceived and expressed in the true Platonic spirit (Plato, indeed is allowed to close the debate), occurs the following sentence which might fittingly be chosen as a motto for the whole series: "Knowledge does not come by indisputable logic; truth is not revealed to those who will not seek, and pay its price; the path of right living is not all in the 'limelight'" (op. cit., p. 307).

The center of the entire discussion of knowledge, conduct, faith, and hope, we take to be chapter 3 in *What Should I Believe?* The heart of that chapter is the section on knowledge and belief which begins on page 82. A part of this all-important section we shall quote, prefacing the citation with a suggestion that the reader begin his study of the four volumes by carefully reading this chapter, thereafter taking up the books in the order suggested by the author himself. Unless we are greatly mistaken, the more extended reading will thus be made far more interesting and suggestive. At any rate the reviewer, when he reached that point in due course, closed the book and retraced his steps over the argument thus far, and then went on to read the whole in the light of that illuminating chapter. Here is a brief section which will give the reader a glimpse of the architecture as a whole:

"Of the underlying intellectual beliefs which make all human knowledge possible, and which decide the forms and limitations of such knowledge in a final and irresistible way, we shall attempt no detailed analysis, or even enumeration. Only as they operate to give laws to the intellect, is knowledge of any sort possible; only as their valid application to the realities coming within the field of human science is taken on faith, is any guarantee of scientific truth attainable. As axioms and postulates incapable of demonstration by a series of logical steps, but irresistibly believed in, they underlie all mathematics and all the mathematical sciences. In the form of unquestioned assumptions, as to the truth of which common sense considers it absurd to admit a doubt, they condition and control all the practical affairs of men, knowledge about which is the indispensable safeguard of their successful conduct. They

reach out into the domain of abstract and speculative thinking, and compel the thinker to admit into his final explanation something beside the factors which derive from the senses and the inferences from their experiences. They demand a kind of reflective thinking which shall take due account of sentiment, of feeling, of intuition, and of faith, in philosophy's speculative construction of the world and of its 'Ground' and of our relations to it."

To see how Professor Ladd guards these statements from misuse as allowing too easy verification to subjective notions the reader is referred to the rest of the book and to the series. In conclusion, we should like to emphasize the fact that among books on the problems of thought and life which can be confidently put into the hands of college students, and thoughtful young people generally, these four volumes are of primary importance.

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET.

WINNING THE WORLD FOR CHRIST*

THIS interesting volume comprises the Cole Lectures for 1915. It accordingly stands in a noble succession which entails rigid exactions, for this lectureship has commanded such able and illustrious names as Charles Cuthbert Hall, John Watson, Bishop McDowell, Robert E. Speer, C. A. Johnston Ross, and a coterie of other equally profound and luminous thinkers. But a careful perusal of Bishop Lambuth's trenchant, virile pages brings the strong assurance that the Cole Lectureship has maintained its high standard of thought and utterance in this latest contribution.

As one progresses in the reading of the book the impression deepens that the subtitle, *A Study in Dynamics*, is well chosen. The whole work is cast in the mold of power. Spiritual energy pulses through every sentence. The insistent demand for the power of God for the completion of the world task, the unlimited supply at our disposal through the Holy Spirit's ministration, the avenue of intercession for the conveyance of the divine power to the lives of Christian heralds, the marvelous manifestations of the Spirit's empowering in many who in the past have yielded themselves to His control, the pre-eminent place which must always be

*Winning the World for Christ, a Study in Dynamics (The Cole Lectures for 1915), by Bishop Walter R. Lambuth, D. D. New York, 1915. Pp. 296.

occupied by the Son of God as the attractive force in the Kingdom of God—all these correlated themes constitute the main portion of the work.

The author possesses a clear and comprehensive grasp of the modern missionary problem. His own experience on the foreign field has put him in vital touch with the realities of the task. One feels the influence of first-hand information everywhere in the book. But there is more than missionary realism to be found; there is expanse of view and a fine sense of proportion that are the outgrowth of the splendid spirit of catholicity which characterizes the lectures. This volume is a distinct contribution to the movement toward unity among the different branches of the Christian church. The compelling objective bulks large in the author's vision, and his voice rings true. There is no covert call here for a unity by the process of absorption. In this regard the discussion of this point happily stands apart from much that is being written and uttered in certain quarters. There is statesmanship in the outlook and sympathies which finds expression in these lectures, and it is a statesmanship that is as fraternal as it is commanding.

The volume is divided into six chapters, corresponding to the six lectures which made up the course. The first deals with The Kingdom of God. Then follow those upon: The Holy Spirit: God Seeking Man; Prayer: Man Seeking God; The Heroic in Missions; A Missionary Church; and Making Christ Pre-eminent. These chapters are original in conception and expression. There is not a dull page in the book. One will search in vain for commonplace utterances. They are not here. The author has availed himself generously of the aid of many masters in the realm of world-evangelization, but they are so articulated with the movement of the argument that they serve to intensify rather than to dissipate the impression at which he aims. The quotations are apt and well chosen. Illustrations abound also in this work. For the most part they will appeal strongly to the reader, and will be valuable to ministers and others who are looking for feathers with which to wing their arrows when called upon for missionary addresses.

If this review should seem to be more of an appreciation than a criticism, the reason will be found in the book itself. There is

much to commend and very little to criticise. The pages are like a trumpet call to a higher life and a more effective service. If any suggestions could be made for the improvement of the treatment of the subject under consideration, they would be in the direction of a more conspicuous place for the redemptive sacrifice on the cross as the message of the Christian missionary. The tone of the book and fragmentary statements which occur rarely leave little doubt as to the author's own steady reliance on the reconciliation which our Lord effected by His death; still one could wish that it might have a more central place. "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself." Christ moves in kingly splendor across the pages of this book. Every earnest reader will be thrilled as he traces His footsteps. We would rejoice if it were more constantly "Christ crucified," who "for us men and for our salvation" endured the cross. But the volume, taken as a whole, will prove invaluable in any missionary library and will help mightily in stimulating those who read it to a deeper determination to win the world for Christ.

HARMON H. McQUILKIN.

THE CHILD IN HUMAN PROGRESS*

THIS book by George Henry Payne is a unique treatment, philosophical and historical, of the child's status and economic and social rights as they have been manifested in various tribes and peoples in the development of the human race. The author has attempted to give by extensive research, recorded in a volume of nearly four hundred pages, the genetic development of our present-day conception of the child's right to life, liberty, and social or civic protection. In the face of the present great production along lines of child study, child labor, child nurture, child welfare, and educational propaganda, this work is a distinct challenge to question seriously the accuracy of the popular conception of the universal acceptance of the significance and worth of the child.

In this volume the author does not discuss the whole problem of the child, but selects as his special theme the world's treatment

*The Child in Human Progress, by George Henry Payne. New York, 1916. Pp. 360.

of the child born to those unwilling or unable to care for it, and from the first chapter of the book to its close it is a long drawn story of inhumanities, neglects, exposures, and impositions practised upon the "undesired children." And all leads to a brief statement of the development of industrial abuses and their punishments, and in the last half century to the prevention of such abuses. It is not a happy story that Mr. Payne presents to us. The shameful inhumanities practised by the strong against the weak and innocent, sufficiently attested to make their historicity indubitable, whips the reader out of complacent satisfaction into a determined resolution to do his part to redeem the honor of the race and save these children, as well as the more fortunate, for their full and rightful inheritance.

In his development of his theme the author draws on all the world's history from the dawn of civilization in Mesopotamia and Egypt, China, India, and Japan. The practice of killing twins as things unnatural, as carried on among the Central Australians, Malays, and Kaffirs, the sacrifice of the first born as related to Passover, and the cannibalistic orgies over children who were not wanted are connected with the sociological justifications of child exposure as practised among the Greeks and Romans.

Mr. Payne gives highest credit to the monotheistic religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism, for amelioration of the child's conditions, but he shows the slow progress of this recognition by the statement: "The best friends of the child—Jesus, the Jewish prophets, and Mohammed—lived centuries before the human theories that they preached had really a living existence. In this connection it is germane to state that the theory that philosophy and religion go hand in hand with humanity is shattered by the fact that Plato, Aristotle, Confucius, and Gautama affected, apparently, not a single jot, the ancient attitude of insufferance toward the undesired children."

The awful horror of this volume, as it traces infanticide, child sacrifice, and child oppression from primitive and barbarous peoples to present times with current standards of civilization, is not softened by the rich love, adoration, and service poured out upon the children of maternal care and paternal solicitude as usually presented in anthropological and sociological studies of the child. The one-sided treatment in Mr. Payne's book, while

consistent and forceful and marked by careful scientific and historical research, is not adequate for the discussion of the subject as announced in the title of his book. One cannot accept the status of the waif, the exposed and unwelcomed children of barbarous or of improvident parents, the tiny toilers of the homes or mills, as an adequate presentation of the general condition of the child in human progress.

Dr. Jacobi in his foreword to this book has well said: "It is a special monograph of the life through thousands of years of slow physical, domestic, economic, social existence of the child." The author in his preface says: "It was in the course of some researches into the origin of the 'Child Protection' movement in this country that I discovered how little attention had been paid to the historical aspect of this important question," and implies that this book is the result of that investigation. This statement explains the emphasis given in the closing chapters to the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the Mary Ellen case, the Gerry Society, the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children, and related movements. Mr. Payne summarizes and justifies his treatment in the following sentences from his closing chapter:

"The general law laid down by Spencer, in virtue of which everything passes 'from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, from the indefinite to the definite, from the simple to the complex,' is evident in the history of the progress of the child as a factor in society.

"When in neolithic times there was no moral instinct in man, the child's only hope of life was the parental, or rather the maternal, instinct of beings not yet risen to the plane of reasoning animals. In a higher stage of civilization one finds, where the matriarchal régime exists, children have a value, the value of chattels and live stock, though the maternal uncle has more rights over them than their own father. The *patria potestas* of the Romans was not so strange or unusual as it seemed to Gibbon, for the power of life and death (*jus vitae ac necis*) is found among the Apaches, the Botocodos, the Bedouins, and the Samoyedes, and is a stage in the development and evolution of the family idea.

"In the religious and philosophical stage the child takes on an importance of its own; it is humanely treated because it is now recognized as a human being, or it is protected because it is said

to have, young and apparently unimportant as it seems to be, a *soul* of its own. From there on to the time when the child, as the father of the man, is a charge upon the state—or on all men—until it is able to take care of and protect itself, the murder of a child is theoretically as great a crime as the murder of an adult. In fact, the conditions of the past hold long after each recognized step of progress, the most primitive habits obtruding in the very midst of the most advanced knowledge and the most complete enlightenment.

“It is for this that the story of the past is valuable. That we may know and understand and value rightly what is past, past for all time so far as intelligent and self-governing humanity is able to will—that is one of the surest steps to knowledge and truth.”

The Napoleonic Decree of 1811 concerning foundlings and the consular reports on present treatment of various races and sects are interesting and valuable appendices, and the bibliography opens vast resources for further study for those interested in the problems of child welfare.

JOHN A. WOOD.

The Biblical Review Endorsed

Since the first number of this quarterly appeared, in January last, we have been greatly encouraged by the many cordial words of approval and endorsement which it has received. We give below quotations from only a very few of the unsolicited opinions that have been brought to our notice:

FROM THE PRESS

Pastors will find it of immense help in practical lines of investigation, as it will pursue a policy related to the richest side of the Christian life and experience.—*Western Christian Advocate*.

We can think of no more useful magazine for Christians who desire to be students of the Scripture.—*The Christian Intelligencer*.

For the studious Bible student who wants serious discussions of Bible subjects from evangelical viewpoints, we think the new BIBLICAL REVIEW is the best.—*The Watchword*.

The magazine in its new form has a solid look that appeals to the scholars of the Christian world.—*Lutheran Church Work and Observer*.

Preachers and Bible students have access here to unusual information and helpfulness in Bible study.—*The Methodist Protestant*.

FROM INDIVIDUALS

It seems to fill a real want, and very happily to combine sound scholarship and popular expression. The paper and press-work are simply delightful.—Professor S. A. Martin, Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania.

Promise myself much pleasure from reading it right through at the earliest opportunity.—Dr. Morris O. Evans, Cincinnati, Ohio. (Managing Editor International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia.)

Your initial number is a splendid issue. The new form and contents are beyond price.—Rev. D. Chambers Stewart, New York.

You have done me, and others, no doubt, a great favor.—Rev. John T. Mobberly, Wilkinsburg, Pennsylvania.

This is going to be the most satisfactory review in existence for its price—even twice the price.—Rev. T. J. Gray, Prosperity, Pennsylvania.

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW
541 LEXINGTON AVENUE NEW YORK

FIFTH SUMMER TERM
A SUMMER SCHOOL IN NEW YORK

FOR PASTORS, THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS, MISSION-
ARY CANDIDATES, MISSIONARIES ON FURLOUGH,
AND OTHER CHRISTIAN WORKERS AND LEADERS

WILBERT W. WHITE, *President*

Six Weeks: June 14—July 25, 1916

COURSES

Eight Strong Courses in the English Bible.
Outline Studies in Old Testament History.
Biblical and Modern Psychology and Pedagogy.
Biblical and Modern Sociology.
Phonetics and Missionary Linguistics.
Twelve Missionary Round-tables (seminars).
Christian Doctrine.
Evangelistic Work and Methods.
Greek and Hebrew Exegesis (if demanded).

A strong teaching staff is provided, and the same kind of work as that done during the regular school year is offered in the summer term.

Courses are arranged in units of ten lessons requiring daily work for two weeks, or its equivalent.

Persons not able to take full six weeks may enter most profitably at the beginning of any two weeks period, viz., June 14, June 28, July 12.

The Bible Teachers Training School is located in the center of excellent transportation facilities, and convenient to the city's great library, museums, parks, social welfare agencies, churches, and other advantages.

For full information and schedule of the summer term, address

JOHN ANDERSON WOOD, *Dean of the Summer Term*

BIBLE TEACHERS TRAINING SCHOOL
541 LEXINGTON AVENUE NEW YORK